FACTORS INFLUENCING IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLANS IN NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS: A CASE OF AFRICA PLATFORM OF SOCIAL PROTECTION, KENYA

DANIEL WAGURA GICHOHI

A Research Project Report Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Award of Masters of Arts Degree in Project Planning and Management, University of Nairobi

2015

DECLARATION

This research project report is my original work and has not been presented for an award in any other university

Signature……………………………………. Date ………………………………

Daniel Wagura Gichohi

L50/68817/2013

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

Signature…………………………………….. Date……………………………………

Prof.Harriet Kidombo

University of Nairobi

College of Education and External Studies

DEDICATION

This research project report is dedicated to Mr. Samuel Gichohi, my father and the late Peris Gichohi, my mother, for instilling the value of education in my early life. Special dedication also goes to my wife, Miriam Gichohi, and our beloved children, Samuel and Peris, for their love and encouragement. God bless you abundantly.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

TABLE OF CONTENT

LIST OF TABLES   PAGE

LIST OF FIGURES   **PAGE**

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AGM   Annual General Meeting

APSP   Africa Platform for Social Protection

BSC   Balance Score Card

CSOs   Civil Society Organizations

DFID   Department for International Development

GOK   Government of Kenya

NCCK   National Council of Churches of Kenya

NGOS   Non-Governmental Organizations

SP   Strategic planning

YWCA   Young Women's Christian Association

ABSTRACT

Many organizations have embraced strategic planning, but the implementation process remains a challenge resulting in well-formulated strategies that fail to be accomplished at the implementation stage. Strategy implementation skills are not easily mastered, unfortunately. In fact, virtually all managers find implementation the most difficult aspect of their jobs- more difficult than strategy formulation.. The ability to implement strategies is one of the most valuable of all managerial skills (Higgins, 2004). Non Governmental Organizations are not an exception. In fact, implementation of the planned strategies is one of their major challenges towards achieving their objectives. This study departed from the previous studies looking into relationships and endeavored to establish the factors influencing implementation of strategic plans in Non-Governmental Organizations in Kenya, with special focus on Africa Platform for Social Protection.

Literature on strategic plan implementation has been studied and presented. This includes literature on the strategic plan implementation globally as well as literature on strategic plans implementation at Africa Platform for Social Protection (APSP). Literature on leadership, communication, organization culture and control and their impact on strategic plans implementation have also been presented.

A conceptual framework has been presented to show the relationship between the variables of the study The researcher used a descriptive survey research design, with a target population of 72 employees in total. Since the total number of staff at Africa Platform for Social protection (APSP) was not vast (seventy two), the researcher performed a census survey as opposed to sampling. This essentially means that all the 72 members of staff at APSP participated in the study. This greatly enhanced the accuracy and reliability of the results. The tools used for data collection are semi-structured questionnaires. Data was thereafter analyzed and presented using descriptive statistics

The study established that the strategic plan was, to a large extent, implemented successfully. The leaders of Africa Platform for Social Protection were committed to the implementation and had the necessary skills and experience. While most of the employees were aware of the existence of the strategic plan, very few knew of its contents basically because sessions for communication of the content and staff roles in the plan implementation were non-existent or were far and in between. However, there was no feedback on implementation of the plan. Policies and performance targets to guide the implementation of the Strategic plan existed. However, performance was not measured against targets and many staff members did not know whether or not plan adjustments had been done based on feedback.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

The nature of today's business has become greatly competitive thus adoption of strategic planning becomes an important element in the strategic management of firms. This is mainly due to the fact that firms ply their existence through an open system and thus are affected by external conditions largely beyond their control (Pearce and Robinson, 1997).

The global business environment has evolved since 1990. This change has brought companies new realities in the form of new business opportunities for growth and, at the same time has exposed them to new competitors. This has caused companies to invest many resources in devising new effective strategies to take advantage of the new opportunities, whilst protecting their market positions, which are crucial to their continued economic existence. Today most of executive managers of organizations, profit and non-profit, spend considerable resources formulating strategies aimed at achieving the objectives of their organizations. These strategic plans are meant to give organizations a comparative advantage over their competitors and/or increase the profitability.

To deal effectively with everything that affects the growth and profitability of a firm, executives employ management processes that they feel will position it optimally in its competitive environment by maximizing the anticipation of environmental changes and of unexpected internal and competitive demands (Pearce and Robinson, 2007). The managers need to come up with a set of decisions and actions that result in the formulation and implementation of plans designed to achieve a company's objectives. According to Arieu (2007), there is strategic consistency when the actions of an organization are consistent with the expectations of management, and these in turn are with the market and the context.

Competition has not spared nonprofit making organizations. Donors are increasingly demanding that non-profit making organizations have viable strategic plans as a pre- precondition for grant offers. The number of non-profit making organizations has increased without commensurate increase in the number of potential donors. This has led to a situation where the potential donors have to choose from a large pool of these non-profit making organizations. As a result, non-profit making organizations have been

forced to compete for funding from donors. Today, nonprofit making organizations are using strategic planning to help them anticipate and respond to the many challenges and opportunities that face them.

Although formulating a consistent strategy is a difficult task for any management team, making that strategy work – implementing it throughout the organization – is even more difficult (Hrebiniak, 2006). A myriad of factors can potentially affect the process by which strategic plans are turned into organizational action. Unlike strategy formulation, strategy implementation is often seen as something of a craft, rather than a science and its research history has previously been described as fragmented and eclectic (Noble 1999b). It is thus not surprising that, after a comprehensive strategy or single strategic decision has been formulated, significant difficulties usually arise during the subsequent implementation process. The best formulated strategies may fail to produce superior performance for the firm if they are not successfully implemented, as Noble (1999b) notes.

Without execution even the most brilliant strategic plan is useless. Many times strategic plans once completed, often are left to gather dust on the shelves. The plan is either ignored or worse yet occasionally disseminated only externally as a kind of public relations tool, to prove that the organization is well managed, to get a grant, or to lure an unsuspecting donor. Eventually this approach damages the credibility of the organization with external constituencies and breeds cynicism among employees, volunteers, and others inside the organization. Many organizations, however, are willing to implement the plans when they are writing them but end up not implementing them

Taking cognizance of the numerous benefits associated with implementation of well prepared strategic plans and the high number of organizations that fail in implementing them, factors that influence implementation of strategic plans in non-governmental organizations will be investigated.

1.1.1 NGOs in Kenya

The Non-Governmental Organizations Co-ordination act, 1990 (no. 19 of 1990), amended through the Kenya Gazette Supplement No. 85 (Act No. 8) 23 October 1992, defines a Non-Governmental Organization as "a private voluntary grouping of individuals or associations, not operated for profit or for other commercial purposes but which have organized themselves nationally or internationally for the benefit of the public at large and for the promotion of social welfare, development, charity or research in

the areas inclusive of, but not restricted to, health, relief, agriculture, education, industry, and the supply of amenities and services" (GoK1990).

Traditionally, NGOs depend on donors for funding. However, overtime, the increased numbers of NGOs competing for donor funding has constrained the amount and level of funding available for each NGO (*The Economist*, 2000). Donors, on the other hand, have reviewed funding policies, preferring to work in blocs of "like-minded donors" and funding only those NGOs with elaborate strategic plans. The situation has meant additional effort for NGOs competing for the meager funds to emerge as leaders in best practice of governance, accountability, efficiency, effectiveness, timeliness and sustainability. As NGOs seek to be effective players in the society, they are faced with the problem of bringing various scarce resources together in forming an organizational that is able to survive in the turbulent environment. Donors are only interested on some areas on the strategic plan which are within their mandate

The need for sustainability calls for prudent management which involves strategic planning. However, it is noted that Strategic Planning process per se is not effective unless the implementation is well executed (Evans, 2007). Although NGOs develop grandiose Strategic Plans, the implementation remains elusive.

1.1.2 Africa Platform for Social Protection

The Africa Platform for Social Protection (APSP) was created in September 2008 as a network of organizations and individuals operating at sub-national, national and regional levels, with a commitment to promoting and strengthening the social contract between states and citizens. The Platform promotes active engagement of African civil society in the shaping of social protection policies, programs, and practices in 25 countries in Africa. The Platform engages in advocacy work at all governance levels to enhance the participation of CSOs in the formulation and implementation of social protection policies and programs and to promote its vision of the way forward for social protection in Africa. Beyond advocacy, the APSP implements capacity building activities for its member organizations –forming to date, 26 national platforms- on social protection and policy engagement skills, evidence gathering, and documentation and dissemination. It also develops stock-taking tools such as an annual review of trends and status of social protection on the continent, and exchange programmes between platforms in different African regions to foster lessons learning and experience sharing.

The organization is governed by a Board of Directors which is elected at the Annual General meeting (AGM) held once every four years. The APSP has a secretariat office in Nairobi, Kenya, whose management is led by the Executive Director. The Executive Director exercises a full mandate to oversee the day-to-day operations of the organization   and is supported by a team of programme, finance and administrative staff who drive the operation of the organization. APSP is funded by institutional donors especially the European Union, DFID and Big Lottery.

Since its inception, APSP has implemented two Strategic Plans. The first one ran between 2008 and 2011 and the second one started in 2012 and will run till end of 2015. The second strategic plan formulation process was conducted through intensive internal and external consultations and drew deeply from participatory and direct engagement with their key stakeholders , namely: the national platforms , representatives of the Government, partners and supporters .Strategic inputs were provided through the APSP Strategy development workshop held with APSP management and all the staff members, consultations with national platforms, inputs from the Board of Directors and partners , as well as donors.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Strategic planning (SP) has received significant attention in recent times. Due to an increasingly competitive marketplace, organizations are recognizing that they can no longer merely react to issues as they emerge if they are to continue as leaders, or survive in the highly competitive market. They must anticipate future change rather than merely react to change. Organizations have to use their limited resources to continue to grow or to survive in the highly competitive market. NGOs too are increasingly finding themselves in complex situation characterized by: an unstable and insecure world leading to resources being diverted to fighting of terrorism, an increase in the number of NGOs without a proportionate increase in the number of donor organizations (Patel 2005) leading to competition for funding, and donor insistence that NGOs have strategic plans as a condition for funding. NGOs are left with no choice but to adopt strategic planning if they have to survive. NGOs are now, more than before, incurring huge budgets in strategic plan formulation. Survival of organizations however is dependent on strategic plan implementation and not formulation. Successful implementation may be the difference between success and failure, or between market leading and mediocrity.

Organizations however continue facing challenges when it comes to the implementation of the strategic plans. Many of them are aware of the benefits associated with successful implementation and are willing to implement but are still unsuccessful when it comes to the actual implementation of their strategic plans. A lot of resources have been spent on formulation of great strategic plans that were to give their owners a competitive edge, which unfortunately did not happen as the plans were either not implemented at all or were implemented partially. Many organizations do not even know whether their strategic plans are implemented or not. Many NGOs, including Africa Platform for Social Protection, would be happy to know what they can do to make their strategic plan implementation efforts successful.

Numerous studies have been done to establish the factors that influence strategic plan implementations. The studies done have established many factors as being the causes or catalysts of strategic plans implementation; organizational leadership, communication, organization culture and control have been mentioned as some of these factors. This study seeks to contribute to implementation literature by studying the factors that influence implementation of strategic plans and specifically how organizational leadership, communication, organizational culture and control influence implementation of strategic plans. This research will contribute to improved strategic plan implementation which many organizations are seeking and need either for survival or to be market leaders.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to establish the factors that influence the implementation of strategic plans in Africa Platform for Social Protection

1.4 Objectives of the Study

The objectives of this study were:

1. To establish the influence of organizational leadership on implementation of strategic plans at Africa Platform for Social Protection
2. To analyze the influence of communication on implementation of strategic plans at Africa Platform for Social Protection
3. To examine how Organizational culture influences implementation of strategic plans at Africa Platform for Social Protection

4. To discuss how control influences implementation of strategic plans at Africa Platform for Social Protection

1.5 Research Questions

The research sought to answer the following questions:

1. To what extent does organizational leadership influence implementation of strategic plans in Africa Platform for Social Protection?
2. To what extent does communication influence implementation of strategic plans in Africa Platform for Social Protection?
3. To what extent does organizational culture influence implementation of strategic plans in Africa Platform for Social Protection?
4. To what extent does control influence strategic plans implementation in Africa Platform for Social Protection?

1.6 Significance of the Study

Findings of this study will provide useful information and insights on factors that will influence the implementation of the next strategic plan at Africa Platform for Social Protection. The findings will be critical in pointing out the areas that Africa Platform for Social Protection needs to work on in order to ensure the next strategic plan is implemented successfully .The findings will also be useful to other organizations as well as they implement their strategic plans. Lastly, the study will be of use to researchers in the area of strategic plan implementation.

1.7 Assumptions of the Study

The study assumed that the respondents would respond to questions put to them and be honest in their answers. The staff members were cooperative as shown by a questionnaire's return rate of 80.6%.

1.8 Limitations of the Study

Time and cost were the main limitations in this research. The researcher was a full time employee who had to juggle between this research and his routine job. The researcher was also financially constrained. The researcher circumvented these limitations by choosing to study an institution that is near his work place, essentially reducing significantly the costs and time needed to carry out this research.

1.9 Delimitations of the Study

This study was carried out in Africa Platform for Social Protection. It studied how the strategic plan for the period 2012-2015 was implemented and the factors that influenced its implementation. The participants in the study were the employees of Africa Platform for Social Protection (APSP). Although there are many factors that influence strategic plan implementation, this study focused solely on organizational leadership, communication, organizational culture and control.

1.10 Definition of Significant Terms Used in the Study

The following are the definitions as used in this research:

Communication

It means availability and accessibility of information about the contents of strategic plan: its purpose, and how it will change the responsibilities of the employees. It includes methods used to discuss the contents of 2012-2015 Strategic Plan, and to report the progress of its implementation.

Control

This entails availability of systems to monitor, evaluate, report and take corrective actions, as needed, to ensure that objectives will be met. Corrective actions means adjusting strategic plan as necessary based on the feedback acquired from monitoring and evaluation.

Culture

Organizational Culture encompasses the attitudes, values, beliefs and behaviors of employees with respect to implementation of 2012-2015 strategic plan. The culture of an organization is as unique and diverse as an individual's personality.

Implementation of Strategic Plans

Implementation means putting into action the 2012-2015 Strategic Plan. It is a process that turns strategic plan into action. It entails providing resources (people, time, and money), involvement of the entire organization, achievement of targets which in turns means achievement of objectives

Leadership

Leadership entails availability and accessibility of the Chief Executive, Program Manager, Human resources manager, project coordinators, monitoring and evaluation officers and the finance manager

who are knowledgeable and experienced in strategic plan implementation .They should also be committed to successful implementation of 2012-2015 strategic plan

Non Governmental Organizations (NGOs)

Non-governmental Organizations are non-profit making Organizations that are neither governmental nor inter-governmental. NGOs are generally established to bring together like-minded individuals committed to achieving particular objectives. They vary considerably in the size of their constituencies, in their organizational structures and in their effectiveness

Strategic Plan

A pattern or plan that integrates an organization's major goals, policies and action sequences into a whole. The crafting of strategic plans represents a commitment to pursue a particular set of actions in growing the business, attracting and retaining customers, competing successfully, conducting operations and improving the company's financial and market performance.

1.11 Organization of the Study

This research project report is organized in five chapters. Chapter One is the introduction and gives the back ground of the study. Chapter Two reviews the literature on strategic plan implementation and on how leadership, communication, organizational culture and control influence strategic plans implementation. It ends with a conceptual framework for the study. Chapter Three describes the research methodology which includes the research design, target population, data collection methods and ends with an operationalization of variables table. Chapter Four describes the return rate of the questionnaires, the demographic characteristic of respondents and the analysis, presentation and interpretation of the findings from the field data collection. Lastly Chapter Five, which outlines a summary of the key outcomes from the study focusing on the issues emerging in relation to the study objectives. The chapter also presents discussions and recommendations made from the study, targeting the employees of Africa Platform of Social Protection (APSP). The chapter presents conclusion of the study and identifies areas for future research.

CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviews strategic plan implementation literature. It also reviews literature on organizational leadership, communication, organizational culture and control how the three influence strategic plan implementation. Discussion on implementation frameworks and theoretical review are also included. The chapter ends by providing a conceptual framework for the study as Figure 1.

2.2 Overview of Chapter Two

Section 2.2 discusses the dependent variable strategic plan implementation. It studies literature on strategic planning under which strategic plan formulation and implementation falls, theories on which the study is based,   and ends by discussing strategic plan implementation frameworks.

2.2.1 Strategic Planning

According to Swayne, Duncan, and Ginter (2008), "strategic planning defines where the organization is going, sometimes where it is not going, and provides focus. The plan sets direction for the organization and through a common understanding of the vision and broad strategic goals provides a template for everyone in the organization to make consistent decisions that move the organization toward its envisioned future. Strategic planning, in large part, is a decision-making activity."

In real sense, whilst strategic planning may be used to effectively plot a company's longer-term direction, one cannot use it to reliably forecast how the market will evolve and what issues will surface in the immediate future. Therefore, strategic innovation and tinkering with the strategic plan have to be a cornerstone strategy for an organization to survive the turbulent business climate. Strategic planning is the formal consideration of an organization's future course. All strategic planning deals with the what, how, when and whom (Kotter, 2007).

Strategic plan has been defined by different authors in different ways. Louw and Venter (2006) defined strategic plan as the overall scheme for leveraging resources to obtain a competitive advantage. Drucker (1993) defines strategic planning as the continuous process of making entrepreneurial decisions systematically and with the greatest knowledge of their futurity, organizing systematically the efforts to carry out these decisions and measuring the results against the plans. Johnson and Scholes (2002) embrace both the resources and environment criteria by describing strategic plans as, the direction and

scope of an organization over the long term which achieves advantage for the organization through its configuration of resources within a changing environment, to meet the needs of markets and to fulfill stakeholder expectations.

Formulation of a strategic plan represents a managerial commitment to pursue a particular set of actions in growing the business, attracting and retaining customers, competing successfully, conducting operations and improving the company's financial and market performance. Thus a company's strategic plans is all about 'hows'- how the management will grow the business, how it will build loyal clientele and out compete its rival, and how each piece of business will function, how performance will be boosted . In most industries, companies have freedom to choose the "hows'' of strategic plans. Some rivals choose to improve their performance and market standing by lowering their costs than rivals, while others pursue product superiority or personalized customer care services, or developing customers of competencies and capabilities that rivals cannot match (Thomson et al 2007)

2.2.2 Strategic Plan Implementation

Implementation is not clearly defined in the relevant literature, despite the presence of interpretations by Noble (1999), Schaap (2006), Singh (1998), Yang Li *et al* (2008), and Harrington (2006). Most studies have discussed it in a general way, encompassing economic, social, psychological, and strategic management (Miller, 2004). Although many authors offer a conceptual description of strategy implementation, it therefore lacks a universal definition. Implementation is often understood to mean "putting something into effect", "enacting" or "realizing" something' (Miller, 1999)

Some of the definitions include: Schaap (2006) who defines implementation as those senior-level leadership behaviors and activities that will transform a working plan into a concrete reality. Dekluyver & Pearce (2003) sees implementation as a hands-on operation and action-oriented human behavioral activity that calls for executive leadership and key managerial skills.
Harrington (2006) sees Strategy implementation as an iterative process of implementing strategies, policies, programs and action plans that allows a firm to utilize its resources to take advantage of opportunities in the competitive environment.
In spite of most of definitions on strategic plan implementation being rather general in nature, most researchers define implementation as a process by which the formulated strategic plans are to be implemented. The most common view on strategic plans implementation is that it is a relatively

straightforward operationalisation of a clearly articulated strategic plan' as argued by Noble (1999). How this operationalization is to be done, or how this process can be characterized remains largely unspecified

Strategic plan formulation has been widely regarded as the most important component of the strategic planning process, more important than strategic implementation. However, recent research indicates that strategic plans implementation, rather than strategic plan formulation alone, is the key requirement for superior business performance (Flood et al 2000; Kaplan and Norton 2000). Implementing strategic plans throughout the organization is even more difficult. Thompson and Strickland (2003) have stressed that the strategic plan implementing is the most complicated and time-consuming part of strategic planning. In addition, there is growing recognition that the most important problems in the field of strategic planning are not related to strategic plans formulation, but rather to strategic plans implementation (Flood et al. 2000), and that the high failure rate of organizational initiatives in a dynamic business environment is primarily due to poor implementation of new strategic plans. Strategy implementation is a connecting loop between formulation and control. Herbiniak (2006) argued that while strategy formulation is difficult, making strategy work and executing it is even more difficult. Similarly, Cater and Pucko (2010) concluded that while 80% of firms have the right strategies, only 14% have managed to implement them well

A study by Sterling (2003) showed that only 30% of strategic plans are properly implemented by companies. Sterling thereafter concluded that it is not easy to implement strategic plans (Sterling 2003). Burnes study (2004) showed 90 percent of formulated strategic plans of firms in the USA and Europe are not implemented on time and with the intended results. The challenges of strategy implementation are illustrated by the unsatisfying low success rate (only 10 to 30 percent) of intended strategies (Raps and Kauffman, 2005). The primary objectives are somehow dissipated as the strategy moves into implementation and the initial momentum is lost before the expected benefits are realized. Successful implementation is a challenge that demands patience, stamina and energy from the involved managers. The key to success is an integrative view of the implementation process (Raps and Kauffman, 2005). Strategic Planning process per se is not effective unless the implementation is well executed (Evans, 2007). Although NGOs develop grandiose Strategic Plans, the implementation remains elusive.

McNamara (2008) observes that a frequent complaint about the strategic planning process is that it produces a document that ends up collecting dust on a shelf – the organization ignores or fails to make good use of the precious information depicted in the strategic planning document. Hambrick and Cannella (1989) states that without successful implementation, a strategic plan is just but a fantasy. Due of the reported high failure rate, strategic plans implementation appears to be a difficult organizational issue. A reason for this difficulty may be that strategic plans implementation is a multifaceted and highly complex organizational phenomenon (Wernham, 1985; Noble, 1999). Given the importance of strategic plans implementation to organizational performance whether profit making or not for profit, its complexity, and high failure rate, implementation should be a topic of high interest for scholars and managers with implementation responsibilities (Flood *et al.*, 2000).

The field of strategic planning has traditionally focused on strategic plans formulation to the detriment of strategic plans implementation (Hrebiniak and Joyce, 1984; Thomas, 2002). Research has placed emphasis on the formulation of strategic plans when the real challenge is argued to lie in implementation (Rapert *et al.*, 2002). However, Strategic plans implementation has received increasing attention in literature in the recent past (Alexander 1991; Grundy 1998; Noble 1999; Beer and Eisenstat 2000; Flood et al. 2000; Kaplan and Norton 2000). Research has shown that even though many organizations incur a huge amount of resources in terms of money and time, very few companies implement these strategic plans.

2.2.3 Need for Strategic Plans Implementation

According to Arieu (2007), implementation of plans is a crucial part of strategic management. Without proper implementation of strategies, then good plans are prone to fail. Strategy implementation include building a firm capability of carrying out strategy successfully, allocating ample resources to strategy-critical activities, establishing strategy-supportive policies, instituting best practices and programs for continuous improvement, tying reward structure to achievement of results, creating a strategy-supportive corporate culture as well as installing support systems.

Formulation of a strategic plan represents management's commitment to pursue a particular set of action in growing the business, attracting and satisfying customers, competing successfully, conducting operations and improving a company's financial and market performance. A clear and logical strategic plan is management roadmap to competitive advantage, to satisfying customers and improving financial

performance (Porter 1996). Among all the management functions, none affects company's ultimate success or failure than how well the management charts the company's direction and develops approaches that ensure that the plan is realized (Thomson, Strickland and Gamble 2008.) Whether a company loses or wins in the market place is directly attributable to the quality of the company's strategic plan and the quality of the implementation of the plan (Miller et al 2002)

Strategic plan implementation is even more important in turbulent times. The environment in which public and private organizations operate is increasingly dynamic or even turbulent. In turbulent environments, the ability to implement a new strategic plan quickly and effectively may well mean the difference between success and failure for an organization (Drazin and Howard 2002; Hauc and Kovac, 2000). Even slight delays can prove critical in highly competitive and dynamic environments.

Nonprofit making organizations have not traditionally been thought of as organizations that needed to be competitively oriented. Unlike for-profit businesses, which compete for customers and whose very survival depends on providing services or products to satisfied, paying clients, many nonprofit making organizations operate in a non-market, or grants economy – one in which services may not be commercially viable. The environment has changed. Nonprofit making organizations are finding that their very success is encouraging others to enter the field and compete for grants; and grant money and contributions are getting harder to come by, even as need and demand increase. Many foundations and government agencies demand that nonprofit making organizations have a viable strategic plan as a condition of a grant or contract. This trend – increasing demand for a smaller pool of resources, requires today's nonprofits to rethink how they do business, to compete where appropriate, to avoid duplicating existing comparable services, and to increase collaboration, when possible. Non-profit organizations have started to adopt business-like techniques (Gorge ,2000) used in the for-profit sector as they are becoming increasingly confronted with market pressures typical of for-profit organizations, like competition for funding and the need to earn money to fulfill their mission (Alexander and Weiner, 1998;).Today nonprofit organizations are trying to use strategic planning to help them anticipate and respond to the many challenges and opportunities looming on the horizon. This therefore means that both profit and nonprofits have to work at creating strategic plans and work on implementing them for their own survival.

2.2.4 Theoretical Review

A theory is defined as a set of interrelated concepts, definitions, and propositions that present a systematic view of phenomena by specifying relations among variables with the purpose of explaining or predicting the Phenomena (Bull, 1991). This study was based on management, communication and Organizational culture theories.

2.2.4.1 Management Theories

Management theories are central to implementation of plans in any organization. Managers should strive to create an environment in which others are motivated to put in their best (Bhargara, 2003). It is incumbent upon the leader to provide direction and purpose for the organization and to carry everyone along with her/him. The manager must get commitment of his subordinates (employees). McGregor and other scholars for example have stressed the importance of mutual goals as a clue to commitment. For many years, the economic theory has proposed to buy worker cooperation by paying wages to be used by wage earners to buy progress toward the personal goals. However, Judge and Robinson (2008) stress the provision of a conducive environment to the employees as key in achieving effectiveness and innovation. Essentially management involves accomplishing goals with and through people. As such, a manager must be concerned about tasks and human relationships. These management concerns seem to be a reflection of two of the earliest schools of thought in organization theory, the 'Scientific Management' movement led by Fredrick W. Taylor in early 1900s and the 'Human Relations' movement led by Elton Mayo and his associates in the 1920s and early 1930s (Cole, 2002).

According to Cole (2002) the Authoritarian Style of management behavior is often based on the assumption that the power of managers is derived from the position they occupy and that people are innately lazy and unreliable (Theory X). The Democratic Style assumes that the power of managers is granted by the group they are to lead, and that people can be basically self-directed and creative at work if properly motivated (Theory Y). Consequently, in the authoritarian style, all policies are determined by the manager, in the democratic style policies are open for group discussion and decision. Theory X employees need to be directed well during strategic implementation because they are not expected to take initiative like Theory Y employees, sometimes they may even need to be coerced.

McClelland (1961) advanced the psychological paradigm which postulates that people with an inner trait of high need achievement (n-arch) are more likely to be more successful at tasks. They feel the need to

excel. This theory further states that people who are highly motivated are likely to take moderate risks, have an internal locus of control, have a strong drive to excel and solve problems. Achievement motivated people can be the backbone of most organizations. As we know, people with a high need for achievement get ahead because as individuals they are producers, they get things done. Managers with n-arch are likely to influence their departments and teams towards effective implementation of strategic plans.

2.2.4.2 Communications Theory

Wolfgang (2006) pointed out that communication is possible only upon a common language between sender and receiver. Marianne, Elain and Zellei (2011) explain Communication Theory as a Field" which expanded the conversation regarding disciplinary identity in the field of communication. Theory of communication proposes a vision for communication that engages in dialogue on the practice of communication. In this deliberative process theorists would engage in dialogue about the "practical implications of communication theories. Leonarda and Susana (2009) explain communication theory as an outline on how each one of the elements of communication processes would engage the others in dialogue. The main elements of communication according to communication theory are seven. First, source which Shannon calls the information source, which "produces a message or sequence of messages to be communicated to the receiving terminal. Second, is sender or transmitter, which "operates on the message in some way to produce a signal suitable for transmission over the channel. Third, is the channel that is "merely the medium   used to transmit the signal from transmitter to receiver. Fourth, is the receiver which performs the inverse operation of that done by the transmitter, reconstructing the message from the signal. Fifth is the destination that is "the person (or thing) for whom the message is intended. Sixth is the message from the receiver that confirms receipt that implies information or communication and the seventh item for effective communication is feedback which in strategic terms is the actualization of what has been communicated.

2.2.4.3 Organizational Culture Theory

This study will also use the Organizational Culture Theory. Different concepts of culture stem from two distinct disciplines, anthropology and sociology. The concepts have been applied to organizational studies since the early 1980's (Schein, 1988). Anthropology views culture as a metaphor for organizations, defining organizations as being cultures. On the other hand, sociology takes on the

functionalist view and defines culture as something an organization possesses. Despite the separate definitions of organizational culture, there seems to be a movement towards a general consensus.

The most widely used organizational culture framework is that of Edgar Schein (1988) who adopts the functionalist view and described culture as a pattern of basic assumptions, invented, discovered, or developed by a given group, as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation, and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid. This culture therefore is to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems.

In Schein's (1988) model, culture exists on three levels: Artifacts - which are difficult to measure; Values –which deal with espoused goals, ideals, norms, standards, and moral principles, and is usually the level that is usually measured through survey questionnaires; and Underlying assumptions - deals with phenomena that remain unexplained when insiders are asked about the values of the organizational culture.

The theory also demonstrates that while there is no single type of organizational culture, the organizational cultures may vary widely from one organization to the next, commonalities do exist and there are theories developed to describe different cultures. Hofstede (1980) demonstrated that there are national and regional cultural groupings that affect behavior of organizations. While O'Reilly, Cardick and Newton (1991, 2005) based their belief on the premise that cultures can be distinguished by values that are reinforced with organizations. Deal and Kennedy (1982) argue that culture is the single most important factor accounting for success or failure of organizations. They identified heroes, rites, rituals and culture networks as four key dimensions of culture. Schein (2005) postulates that organization culture theory is a pattern of shared basic assumptions learned by a group as it solves its problems of external adaptation and internal integration that has worked well enough to be considered valid and therefore to be taught to new members as correct way to perceive, feel and think in relation to the problems. Studies (Peters & Waterman, 1982; Aldins & Caldwell, 1991) suggest that efficiency outcomes are associated directly or indirectly with organizational culture. A culture of efficiency, effectiveness, commitment and oneness is robust and would provide positive outcomes.

2.2.5 Frameworks for Strategic plans implementation

Implementation is a key stage of the strategy process, but one which has been relatively neglected (Noble, 1999). Despite this it is generally perceived as a highly significant determinant of performance.

As Noble (1999:119) states, "well formulated strategies only produce superior performance for the firm when they are successfully implemented". The management handling implementation of strategic plan may be considered successful if and when the company achieves the target performance and shows a good progress in making its strategic vision a reality. The specific how's of executing a strategic plan always have to be customized to fit the particulars of a company's situation. There is no one way of bringing the desired changes for all organizations at all times; people may prefer one approach to another in implementing a strategic plan based on their organization's situation (Thomson, Strickland and Gamble 2007). Researchers have identified many factors that influence strategic plans implementation.

These factors include leadership, communication, control, organizational structure, culture and stakeholders, among others. Frameworks have been developed which include either one or most of these factors. Implementation requires a guide, and without one implementation becomes haphazard. Without guidance people do what they think is important, often leading to uncoordinated, divergent, and even conflicting decisions and actions. Having a framework often enhances execution success and not having one leads to failure or frustration (Kaplan and Norton 2003, Okumu 2003, Noble 1999). Many frameworks have been developed to assist in implementation of strategic plans some being custom made for nonprofit making organizations. Some of the frameworks available for non profits include:

The Balanced Scorecard (BSC) was developed by Kaplan and Norton (1992).It has become a very popular tool for strategic plans implementation, performance measurement and strategic tool because it incorporates both lag and lead performance measures. Balance score card may be defined as a strategic planning and management system used to align business activities to the vision statement of an organization'. Balanced Scorecard attempts to translate the sometimes vague, pious hopes of a company's vision/mission statement into the practicalities of managing the business better at every level. (Kaplan 2003)Kaplan and Norton,(1996 b) claim that the balanced score card provides a framework for managing the implementation of strategic plans while also allowing the strategic plan itself to evolve in response to changes in the company's competitive market and technological environment.The original balanced scorecard formulation, which most companies use today, was organized around four perspectives that were given these labels: financial, customer, business processes and learning and development (Atkinson 2006). The initial Balance Score Card could not be implemented without difficulties in nonprofit organizations. Non profits needs are, among others, assessing whether their

clients' needs are being met as opposed to for profit organizations whose focus is increasing profitability. Kaplan and Norton's Balanced Scorecard has been modified to fit the non profits. (Kaplan 2003) .The original four perspectives were tailored to better match nonprofit organizations' special features. Thus, several modifications were made. The financial perspective at the top of the original Balanced Scorecard was replaced with the organizations' mission and objectives. Placing mission and objectives at the top of the scorecard means a focus on outcomes, that the organizations are supposed to accomplish, rather than on the activities. The activities are seen as tools to help in creating impact on mission and objectives (Kaplan and Norton 2003).

However the balanced score card approach received criticism to the effect that, "The effective integration of the balance scorecard with strategic control systems remained a potentially significant inhibitor to successful strategic plans implementation" (Atkinson 2006). Atkinson (2006) found that this inhibition was caused by a lack of a relationship between the balanced scorecard model and the various budgeting systems clearly indicated a need for further empirical research .In response to the criticisms on the balanced score card, Kaplan and Norton produced further work on it resulting in a book, "Strategic plan Maps: Converting intangible assets into tangible outcomes" (Kaplan and Norton 2004). Kaplan and Norton (2004) realized that executives wanted to apply the system to solve the problem associated with how to implement new strategic plans. The second criticism is about the top management's involvement. The balance score card has also been criticized for its top-down approach which limits the participation from lower levels management. It means that the contribution is manipulated by the top level management. (Nooreklit 2000) The technique has also been criticized for not giving much emphasis on many explanations of the problems in strategic plan implementation which involve conflicts and power struggles among interest groups, organizational culture, resource allocation and trainings. It is just looking deep inside into the strategic plans implementation (Okumu 2003).

Macmillan Matrix is another matrix that organizations can use to implement their strategic plans. The MacMillan Matrix was specifically designed to help nonprofits assess their programs. The matrix is based on the assumption that duplication of existing comparable services (unnecessary competition) among nonprofit organizations can fragment the limited resources available, leaving all providers too weak to increase the quality and cost-effectiveness of client services.(Mac Millan 1983)The matrix assumes that trying to be all things to all people can result in mediocre or low-quality service; instead,

non profits should focus on delivering higher-quality service in a more focused (and perhaps limited) way. The matrix therefore helps organizations think about some very pragmatic questions: whether they are the best organization to provide the service, competition is good for their clients; they are spreading too thin, without the capacity to sustain themselves, and whether they should work cooperatively with another organization to provide services.

The Okumu's (2003) strategic plan implementation framework is meant to assist organizations with strategic plan implementation during complex times of non-equilibrium and non-coherence (Okumus 2003). A state of non – equilibrium and non –coherence occurs when there is no stability in an organization due to changing business environment. This is the practical challenge faced by leaders and managers, namely implementing a dynamic approach to strategic plan formulation and implementation during times of change. Okumus strategic plan implementation framework gives guidelines on how to carry out strategic plans implementation processes and connect the linking implementation factors appropriately (Okumu 2003).

Nobles framework (Noble 1999b) identified five managerial 'levers' for strategic plans implementation. These levers are goals, organizational structure, leadership, communications, and incentives. *Goals* are important in effective implementation because an implementation requires clear objectives. Changes in the organizational *structure* are often needed during the implementation. *Leadership* often plays a critical role in determining implementation performance. Especially the role of having a powerful champion is considered important. *Communications* is important because the details of the implementation efforts need to be communicated as early and as thoroughly as possible. Finally, *incentives* are an important tool for inspiring organizational members to change in accordance with the new strategic plan.

There are important similarities among the implementation frameworks in terms of the key factors forwarded and the assumptions made. The overriding assumption of these frameworks is that multiple factors should be considered simultaneously when developing and implementing a strategic plan. In the remaining part of chapter two, we will examine literature on how organizational leadership, communication and organization culture influence strategic plan implementation.

2.3 Leadership and Strategic Plan Implementation

Organizational leadership is guiding and shepherding toward a vision over time and developing that organization's future leadership and organizational culture (Pearce and Robinson, 2007). Leadership remains one of the most relevant aspects of the organizational context. It is a process of social influence in which one person can enlist the aid and support of others in the accomplishment of a common task. Leadership is about capacity: the capacity of leaders to listen and observe, to use their expertise as a starting point to encourage dialogue between all levels of decision making, (George J.M. 2000).Leadership and especially strategic leadership is widely described as one of the key drivers of effective strategic plan implementation (Kaplain & Norton, 2004). However, lack of leadership and specifically strategic leadership by the top management of an organization, has been identified as one of the major barriers to effective strategy implementation (Hrebiniak, 2008).

Strategic leadership is defined as "the leader's ability to anticipate, envision and maintain flexibility and to empower others to create strategic change as necessary (Hitt, Ireland &Hoskison, 2007).

While issues of strategic planning have presented challenges to strategic leaders, it is in the area of strategy implementation where leaders have encountered a number of challenges. Hrebiniak (2006) reported that although formulating a consistent strategy and making it worth is fairly easy, implementing it through the organization is even more difficult. Allio (2005) also concluded from an economic survey of 276 senior operating executives that a discouraging 57% of firms were unsuccessful at executing strategic initiatives. To effectively undertake strategic plan implementation strategic leaders need to have skills on communication, motivation, decision making and team building. According to Pearce and Robinson (2002) two leadership issues are of fundamental importance: the role of the chief executive office (CEO) and the assignment of key managers. Al-Ghamdi (1998) agreed with Alexander (1985) that poor leadership and direction at departmental level are an implementation challenge. Galpin (1998) pointed out lack of leadership as deadly sin of strategy implementation

The leaders have the responsibility of selling the strategic plan to the rest of the organization and thus ensuring the buy in of the strategic plans. Some of the managers may be skeptical about the merits of the strategic plans, seeing it as contrary to the organizations interests, unlikely to succeed or threatening to their careers. It is the responsibility of the managers to explain to their subordinates the need for the strategic plan in a manner that will secure the buy in, enthusiasm and commitment of all the concerned

parties. (Thomson et al 2007). Nutt (1986) suggested that the tactics used in leadership plays an important role in overcoming obstructions from the lower levels that sometimes may appear in the implementation strategies. Nutt (1987) noted that strategic decisions formulated by the top managers of a firm may be administratively imposed on lower-level managers and non managers while inadequately considering the resulting functional level perceptions. The implementation of strategies therefore, may not be successful if the lower level managers and the non-management employees are not adequately informed on issues concerning the implementation of strategies, moreover, where the information passes through several management levels in an organization may lead to lack of consensus concerning the information hence creation of a barrier that hinders the success of implementing a strategy (Noble, 1999b). Chimanzi and Morgans (2005) study indicated that firms which focus their attention to involvement of all employees significantly realize higher percentages of strategy implementation. Therefore Chimanzi and Morgan's (2005) proposed that organization should involve all the employees for the success of the strategy.

Recent researches have established that, top executive's main role is to make sure the smooth procedure of the implementation and furthermore to communicate successfully the strategic plan; reasons for it and the changes it brings. Karami (2005) recommends that the top management team should incorporate middle management in strategic plans formulation and/or efficiently disseminates objectives and strategies through the management structure in order to enhance implementation. The leaders also play the role of ensuring that the strategic plan is understood by all the members of the organization. Different employees may interpret the new strategic plan differently or have different ideas about what internal changes are needed to execute it. The leadership is required to clear doubts and disagreements by giving the correct interpretation and assurance. The middle and the low level managers are responsible for initiating and supervising the execution process in their areas of authority as well as getting the subordinates to continuously improve on how the strategic plan's critical activities are being performed and in producing operating results that allow company's performance targets to be met (Thomson et al 2007).

In addition to whether members of a unit support a new strategic direction, there is strong evidence that the manager of the group or unit may influence the speed and effectiveness with which new processes can be implemented. Although senior leaders play a critical role in identifying and implementing a new

strategy (c.f., House & Aditya, 1997; Thomas, 1988), middle level managers within an organization may, through their leadership of groups within the organization, either enhance or undermine the organization's ability to implement a strategic change. For example, if managers do not support a strategy because it runs counter to their interests, they may delay implementing it or even sabotage the success of the new efforts (Guth &MacMillan, 1986). When middle managers are involved in and committed to the strategy, success is more likely (Wooldridge & Floyd, 1990). Within a single firm, the choices made by individual managers can influence the speed with which units adopt practices supporting a new strategy (Maritan & Brush, 2003). This suggests that understanding the extent to which the intangible factors within a group can support implementation will be influenced by the leader of the unit

Effective leadership is required for successful strategy implementation, in a competitively chaotic environment, one essential contribution of a strategic leader is to provide and share a clear vision, direction and purpose for the organization (Thompson, 1997) The CEO's action and the perceived seriousness to a chosen strategy will influence subordinate managers' commitment to the strategy implementation. The personal goals and values of a CEO strongly influence a firm's mission, strategy and key long term objectives. The right managers must also be in the right positions for the effective implementation of a new strategy (Jones and Hill, 1997

2.4 Communication and Strategic Plan Implementation

Communication is the key to gaining people's involvement and significantly reducing their level of uncertainty in the activities of an organization (Burnes, 2004). It is the lifeblood of an organization and without effective communication; the pattern of relationships that we call organizations will not serve anyone's needs. Communication should be a regular rather than a one-off exercise and should be pursued through various channels that management deem fit to access the employees of an organization. People need to be involved in the strategic plan implementation and hence a continuous message effectively communicated will energize people into fully participating in the organization activities.

According to Peng and Littleljohn (2001) effective communication is a key requirement for effective strategy communication. Organization communication plays an important role in training, knowledge dissemination and learning during the process of strategy implementation. Therefore effective communication should clearly explain the new responsibilities, duties and tasks which will be done by

targeted employees. The management should ensure every staff member understands the strategic vision, the strategic themes and what their role will be in delivering the strategic vision. It is important that all employees are aware of expectations. How are they expected to change? What and how are they expected to deliver? Each individual must understand their functions within the strategy, the expected outcomes and how they will be measured. Rapert and Wren (1998) found out that organizations where employees have easy access to management throughout open and supportive communication climates tend to outperform those with more restrictive communication environments.

According to Alexander (1985) findings, communication was among the most frequently mentioned item which was behind the promotion of successful implementation of a strategy. Chimanzi and Morgan's (2005) study indicated that firms which focus their attention to marketing and involvement of all employees significantly realize higher percentages of strategy implementation. Therefore, Chimanzi and Morgan's (2005) proposed that managers in charge of marketing should focus on improving relationships with the their counterparts (human resource) by advocating for communication which is written and reward systems which are joint hence putting more emphasis on a two way process based dimension. Rapert, Velliquette and Garretson (2002) observed that shared communication and understanding among human resources is an important aspect in strategy implementation process. For instance, through communicating vertically, the shared understanding about the prioritized strategies are likely to be enhanced hence leading to improvements.

Communication defines what new responsibilities, tasks, duties, and strategic decisions are all about. However, there is communication challenge of lack of instituting two-way communication that permit and solicit questions from employees about formulated strategies, and potential problems (Alexander, 1985). Moreover, the challenge of lack of instituting two-way communication both top down and across functions affects the understanding of the strategy, and proper change management (Aaltonen and Ikavalko,2002; Hrebiniak, 2006). According to Aosa(1992) Communication should be a regular rather than a one-off exercise and should be pursued through various channels that management deem fit to access the employees of an organization. People need to be involved in the strategic plan implementation and hence a continuous message effectively communicated will energize people into fully participating in the firm activities.

Throughout the implementation process, communication should flow bottom-up to allow management to monitor the implementation process and determine whether changes to the approach are needed (Neilson et al, 2008; Beer et al, 2000; Hambrick et al, 1989; Alexander, 1985).Top down communication is also necessary; It has been found that the people who work for an organization normally need effective communication for supervision of employees to ensure that they are performing the tasks they are expected and in the manner they are supposed to, and to collect feedback from the implementers.(Klein and Ritti, 1985).

Even though studies point out that communication is a key success factor within strategy implementation, communicating with employees concerning issues related to the strategy implementation is frequently delayed until the changes have already crystallized. Communication should be done to employees about new requirements, tasks and activities to be performed by the affected employees. Also findings of peng and littleJohn (2001) show that effective communication is a key requirement for effective strategy implementation. Failing to communicate with all employees invites rumors and fear into the workplace; Employees want to know what's going on, whether it is positive or negative news. The feeling of uncertainty when management doesn't communicate disrupts work and makes employees feel as if they aren't a part of the decision. Keep employees updated regularly about the plans and progress toward the change implementation. Involve all employees as much as possible through meetings or brainstorming sessions to help during the planning phase. Miniace and Falter (1996) stated that communication stands out as the key success factor when it comes to strategy implementation. It is imperative for an organization to develop a comprehensive communication plan in order to improve the success rate of its implementation programme.

Robinson and Pearce (2004) have observed that miscommunication occurs between the point where communication starts and the point where it is received. More so, the interpretation of that communication plays a vital role which requires managers to be enforcing a strong culture that embrace clear understanding of communications from all corners of the organization. This means that managers must be aware of people's beliefs, attitudes, behaviour, demands and arguments in order to communicate effectively the message of strategic plan implementation to the employees (Burnes, 2004). Strategic plans have to be demonstrated to the people through regular and effective communication

channels. If a person does not understand what has to be done, then he/she cannot own the process and will thus not be able to deliver since no one can apply what they do not properly understand (Sterling 2003).

2.5 Organizational Culture and Strategic Plan Implementation

Thomson and Strickland (1996) define organization's cultures as the policies, practices, traditions, philosophical beliefs, and ways of doing things. Hill et al (2009) define organizational culture as the "specific collection of values, norms, beliefs and attitudes that are shared by people and groups in an organization and that control the way they interact with each other and with stakeholders outside the organization". Weihrich & Koontz (1993), looks at culture as the general pattern of behavior, shared belief and values that members have in common. We perceive there is no consensus on comprehensive definition, in accordance with Mary Jo Hatch and TammarZilber (2012), cultures cannot be accurately or completely described at all. Even so, all the definitions are close in the notion they convey and bring us to define organizational culture: A range of beliefs and shared values that unifies members of an organization and consolidates them under the cover of potent behavioral norms and rules.

An organization's culture and associated values dictate the way decisions are made, the objectives of the organization, the type of competitive advantage sought, the organizational structure and systems of management, strategies and policies, attitudes towards managing people and information systems. Culture can be inferred from what people may do and think within an organization setting. It involves the learning and transmitting of knowledge, beliefs and pattern of behavior over time. This means that organizational culture is fairly stable and does not change fast. It sets the tone for the company and establishes rules on how people should behave. Kalali et al. (2011) found organizational culture conflicting with the strategy being implemented as a major challenge.

A significant body of research clearly indicates that organizational culture and specifically the extent that it is aligned or not aligned with strategy, is the single most important factor in determining whether or not strategy is successfully executed and performance goals achieved (Lee & Yu, 2004). Curran (2002) a researcher and practitioner in the healthcare sector wrote "culture eats strategy for lunch every time". In this simple statement she has eloquently summarized one of the strongest themes in the

literature on strategy implementation, which is that it doesn't matter how wonderful your organization's strategy is, if it will not be realized.

Therefore aligning organizational culture to strategy accelerates strategy execution. It is followed by the top down communication. Senior management will share the strategic plan with employees. They will communicate to all employees how their engagement will help ensure success in the execution of these strategies

Every organization has its own culture. These shared assumptions (beliefs and values) among a firm members influence opinions and actions within that firm. A member of an organization can simply be aware of the organizations beliefs and values without sharing them in a personally significant way. Those beliefs and values have more personal meaning if the member views them as a guide to appropriate behavior in the organization and, therefore, complies with them. Assumptions become shared assumptions through internalization among an organization's individual members (Pearce and Robinson, 2004). Organization culture is shaped by the leaders. This is illustrated by the passion they bring to their role, and their choice and development of young managers and future leaders. Passion, a highly motivated sense of commitment to what you do and want to do, is a force that permeates attitudes throughout an organization and helps them buy into your cultural aspirations (Johnson G et al, 2004).

Managing the strategy-culture relationship requires different approaches, depending on the match between the demands of the new strategy and the compatibility of the culture with the strategy. Due to the rising needs of strategic management in every organization, leaders should facilitate a culture that promotes effective strategy formulation and implementation. According to Deal T E et al, (2005), organization culture should be changed to fit the strategy. This can only be done through cultural innovation followed by cultural maintenance. Cultural innovation includes: creating a new culture i.e. recognizing past cultural differences and setting realistic expectations for change. Secondly, it includes changing the culture i.e. weakening and replacing the old cultures. Culture maintenance includes integrating the new culture which is, reconciling the differences between the old cultures and the new one. Also,it includes, embodying the new culture which means establishing affirming and keeping the new culture

2.6 Control and Strategic Plan Implementation

Control may be defined as management process of systematically and continuously checking to determine whether the premises upon which the strategic plans are based are still valid. Strategic control is necessary to steer the firm through changes in the environment and the firm's internal situation during the implementation of the strategic plans. (Pearce and Robinson 2011) .Control is the facilitation of feedback and learning (Ittner and Larcker 2005).

Control should provide accurate and timely information on organizational performance to ensure correct decision-making by managers. (Hill et al 2009). Strategic control systems are the formal target-setting, measurement, and feedback systems that allow strategic managers to evaluate whether a company is achieving superior efficiency, quality, innovation, and customer responsiveness and implementing its strategic plans successfully. (Hills and Jones 2010) Control systems in an organization provide incentives and motivation to management and other employees to pursue the right activities towards achievement of organizational goals. On the other hand, control systems facilitate monitoring and evaluation of performance and progress on strategic goals. This enables managers to take action to, if necessary, adapt and strengthen the organization's business model. To allow managers to respond to unexpected events, the control system has to be flexible.

The monitoring of strategic plans performance progress is influenced by the specific nature and definition of measures, reporting system quality and strategic plans process review characteristics (Kaplan and Norton 2005). When designing an effective control system, an organization first determines the targets against which performance will be measured. Control systems should be designed at all levels in the organization, and targets have to be fit to the activities that the employees are responsible for. Moreover, it should be determined, which behavior is rewarded, and how these rewards relate to performance. These behaviors are measured with the control systems. Next, the organization should create means for measuring and monitoring performance. Then, performance can be compared with the established standards to evaluate whether action should be taken to better pursue attainment of strategic goals (Hill et al, 2009).

Picken and Dess (1997) stress the need to constantly monitor changes both within the firm and in the competitive environment and to adapt both goals and strategies to the changing realities. Mintzberg (1994) argues that the critical aspect of the strategic plans must be taken into consideration, which is the

activity of assessing whether strategies were realized, whether intended or not. He further suggests that strategic plans must satisfy four broad criteria:

- Consistency. The strategic plans must not present mutually inconsistent goals and policies.
- Consonance. The strategic plans must represent an adaptive response to the external environment and to the critical changes occurring within it.
- Advantage. Strategic plans must provide for the creation and/or maintenance of a competitive advantage in the selected area of activity.
- Feasibility. The strategic plans must never overtax available resources

A strategic plan must be evaluated against each of these criteria; if it fails to meet one or more of them, the strategic plan is flawed. Lack of control and monitoring of strategic plans performance progress, lack of consistency in monitoring and lack of support of the staff in its performance are barriers to strategic plan implementation. The monitoring of strategic plans performance progress is influenced by the specific nature and definition of measures, reporting system quality and strategic plans process review characteristics. Their main task is to provide information on the progress and results of strategic plans performance (Kaplan and Norton 2005)

The management needs to ensure that the parameters to be measured are minimal and reasonable. The measurement of numerous parameters creates the excess of information, the absorption whereof being impossible for the managerial staff. This leads to decision incapability on the issued playing the major role in effective strategic plans performance. It means that directing towards the measurement of what is important as well as the preliminary analysis of results and distinguishing the most significant questions at the expense of those of lesser importance for the strategic plan and its performance. The inappropriate review of strategic plans is another reason for failure to perform it. The operating issues absorb a significant part of the manager's attention, pushing the strategic actions towards the background (Rafoni 2008).

2.7 Conceptual Framework for the Research

Independent	Moderating	Dependent
Variables	**Variable**	**Variable**

Organizational Leadership

- availability
- Accessibility
- knowledge
- commitment

Government policies

Communication
- Channels of communication
- Accessibility
- Training
- Frequency

Strategic plans Implementation

- Achievement of targets
- availability
- knowledge
- involvement

Organizational culture

- Conducive
- Supportive
- Influence objectives

Control

- Availability
- Frequency
- Knowledge

Global Financial crisis

Intervening Variable

Figure 1: Conceptual Framework for the Research

The conceptual framework shows how the independent variables: Organizational leadership, communication, Organizational culture and control interact with the dependent variable. It also shows the moderating and intervening variables which influence the relationship.

2.8 Knowledge Gap

Previous studies did not examine the influence of major factors in the link between strategic planning and Implementation. Wambui (2006) focused on managerial involvement related to Strategy Implementation. This represented one aspect of factors that influence implementation leaving a gap to be pursued by other scholars. Korten (1990) studied the environment under which NGOs fail to implement their strategic plans but did not directly scan the other factors that affect NGO strategic plan implementation. Cater and Pucko (2010) studied poor leadership as the biggest obstacle to strategy execution in Eastern Europe, and not Africa. The implementation gaps illuminated by previous studies (Awino, 2007; Mintzberg, 1994; Letting, 2009; Arasa, 2008; Aosa, 1992; Cater & Pucko, 2010) such as poor leadership, poor communication and lack of control, will be brought into account. This study sought to investigate the factors affecting implementation of strategic plans.

2.9 Summary of literature review

The literature review has reviewed literature on strategic planning under which strategic formulation and implementation falls, and on the influence of Organizational leadership, communication, Organizational culture and control on strategic plan implementation. According to McDonel (1990), Finlay (2000) and Katsioloudes (2002), strategic planning provides significantly better performance than unplanned, opportunistic adaptive approach. It provides an integrative framework for other forms of planning. Strategic plan formulation has been widely regarded as the most important component of the strategic planning process, more important than strategic implementation. However, recent research indicates that strategic plans implementation, rather than strategic plan formulation alone, is the key requirement for superior business performance (Holman 1999; Flood et al 2000; Kaplan and Norton 2000).It has also reviewed implementation frameworks. A conceptual framework has been presented as Figure 1 to show the relationship between the dependent and the independent variables for the study.

CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the research design chosen for the study, target population, the sampling techniques, and the data collection methods and data analysis techniques employed for the research. Operationalization of variables is also included as Table 3.1.

3.2 Research Design

Research design is the conceptual structure within which research is conducted and that it constitutes the collection, measurement, and analysis of data (Kothari, 2004). Therefore, research design sticks together the major parts of the research project and enables to address the intended research questions. Descriptive survey design was found ideal for this study.. Orodho (2009) states that Descriptive Research Design is important in carrying out both exploratory and preliminary studies as it permits researchers in collecting information, summarizing and interpreting with the view of clarifying the information. While Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) on the other hand gives the purpose of descriptive research as determining and reporting the way things are. Descriptive research design allows statistical computation of percentages and correlations, which were used in reporting the findings of this study

This study has discussed the relationship between organizational leadership, communication, organizational culture and control, and strategic plan implementation by collecting and analyzing data on the four variables to establish whether organizational leadership, communication, organizational culture and control influence strategic plan implementation at Africa Platform for Social protection

3.3 Target Population

According to Orodho (2004) a target population is the total individuals, elements or groups to be studied. Nachmias defines population as the aggregate of all cases that conform to same designated set of specifications (Nachiamas and Nachiamas 1996). Target population constitutes the entire or totality of the items under study (Kothari, 2004).

The target population for this study was all the members of staff of Africa Platform for Social Protection (APSP), made up of 42 permanent staff and 30 semi- permanent workers

3.4 Sampling Procedure

Since the total number of staff of Africa Platform for Social protection (APSP) was not vast, (72), the researcher performed a census survey as opposed to sampling. This essentially means that all the 72 staff of APSP participated in the study. This greatly enhanced the accuracy of the results.

According to Kothari (2004), when the universe is a small one, it is no use resorting to a sample survey; the entire population should be taken into account for greater reliability and accuracy of results. Census survey provides a true measure of the population (no sampling error) and detailed information about small subgroups within the population is more likely to be available

3.5 Instruments of Data Collection

The research used both primary and secondary data obtained through structured questionnaires consisting of both open ended and closed questions. Neuman, (2011) asserts that questionnaires give respondents freedom to express their views or opinion and also to make suggestions. Researchers use questionnaires so that they can obtain information about the thoughts, feelings, attitudes, beliefs, values, perceptions, personality, and behavioral intentions of the research participants in a large population. Questionnaires provide data in the same form from all respondents. The content and organization of a questionnaire will correspond to researcher's research objectives (Barbie & Mouton, 2008).

3.6 Validity of Research Instruments

Nachmias defines validity as the ability of the data instruments to measure what they are intended to measure (Nachmias and Nachmias 1996). It determines whether the research truly measures that which it is intended to measure and how truthful the research results are Joppe (2000). To test the validity of the research instruments a pilot study was carried out to identify the research instruments that were ambiguous. This involved distributing samples of the research instruments to five respondents; hence their response and understanding of the questions were analyzed. Ambiguity and irrelevant information noted in the questionnaire was modified for validity purpose. The respondents were also requested to respond on the clarity of the questions presented to them**.**

3.7 Reliability of Research Instruments

Joppe (2000) defines reliability as the extent to which results are consistent over time and an accurately represent total population under study. If the results of a study can be reproduced under a similar

methodology, then the research instrument is considered to be reliable. Embodied in this citation is the idea of repeatability of results or observations.

Reliability in this research was tested through Split half method. In split-half reliability, all items that purport to measure the same construct are randomly divided into two sets. The entire instrument was then administered to a sample of people and the total score for each was randomly divided into half and then reliability calculated. The split-half reliability estimate is the correlation between these two total scores (Trochim 2006). In this study half of the study items (even numbered) was correlated with the other half (odd numbered) to obtain a reliable coefficient.

A week prior to data collection, the researcher conducted a pilot study where five questionnaires were administered to respondents who were not part of the study. The pilot study helped in testing the quality of data collection tools. Necessary adjustments were made on the tools before embarking on the final study. To enhance the honesty of the respondents, each person that was approached was given an opportunity to refuse to participate in the study so as to ensure that the data collection sessions involved only those who were genuinely willing to take part in the study and were prepared to offer data freely. Participants were encouraged to be frank from the outset of each session.

3.8 Data Analysis

Data analysis refers to examining what has been collected and making inferences and deductions (Kombo and Tromp, 2006).Data collected was analyzed using Microsoft Excel version 2007 and presented using descriptive statistics and Pearson's correlations. Before the analysis was done, the data was checked for completeness and consistency. It was then coded and entered into the appropriate computer package

3.9 Ethical Considerations

The researcher observed research ethical standards by informing the research participants about the nature of the research and that their identities would be kept confidential. All the participants were given an opportunity to voluntarily take part in the research.

3.10 Operationalization of Variables

Table 3.1 presents the operationalization of variables Table that shows the variables, the indicators, measures and methods of data analysis.

Table 3 1: Operationalization of Variables

Objective	Variable	Indicator	Measurement	Measurement Scale	Data collection Method	Analysis
To establish how organizational leadership influences implementation of strategic plan in Africa Platform for Social Protection.	**Independent Variable:** Leadership	Availability of qualified and experienced leaders Accessibility Commitment	Leaders qualification Years of experience Scheduled meetings Frequency of meetings Attendance of meetings Forums	Ratio Ordinal Ordinal Ordinal Ratio Ratio	Questionnaire Questionnaire Questionnaire Questionnaire Questionnaire Questionnaire	Descriptive Descriptive Descriptive Descriptive Descriptive Descriptive
To analyze how communication influences the implementation of strategic plans in Africa Platform for Social Protection.	**Independent Variable:** Communication a) Strategic plan b) Feedback on implementation.	Accessibility Channels of communication Trainings on strategic plan	Accessibility of strategic plan document Accessibility of information Methods of communication Awareness sessions Training sessions Knowledge of the contents of strategic plan	Ratio Ratio Ordinal Ordinal Ordinal Ordinal	Questionnaire Questionnaire Questionnaire Questionnaire Questionnaire Questionnaire	Descriptive Descriptive Descriptive Descriptive Descriptive Descriptive

		Frequency	Frequency of communication on strategic plan	Ordinal	Questionnaire	Descriptive
To examine how Organizational Culture influences the implementation of Strategic plans in Africa Platform for Social Protection	**Independent variable**: Organizational Culture	Values and beliefs	Personal initiative	Ordinal	Questionnaire	Descriptive
		Communication styles	Method of communication	Ordinal	Questionnaire	Descriptive
		Culture and implementation of strategic plan	Implementation committee	Ratio	Questionnaire	Descriptive
		Culture and achievement	Achievement of target	Ratio	Questionnaire	Descriptive
To Discuss how Control influences the implementation of Strategic plans in Africa Platform for Social Protection	**Independent Variable:** Control	Availability	Implementation framework document	Nominal	Questionnaire	Descriptive
			Monitoring and evaluation framework.	Nominal	Questionnaire	Descriptive
			Supportive policies	Ordinal	Questionnaire	Descriptive
		Frequency	Implementation report	Ratio	Questionnaire	Descriptive
			Adjustment of strategic plan.	Nominal	Questionnaire	Descriptive
		Knowledge	Knowledge of targets	Ordinal	Questionnaire	Descriptive

To analyze the degree of strategic plan implementation at Africa Platform for Social Protection	**Dependent variable:** Strategic plan implementation	Knowledge	Awareness of existence of a strategic plan	Ratio/Nominal	Questionnaire	Descriptive
			Knowledge of the contents of the plan	Ordinal/Nominal	Questionnaire	Descriptive
			Achievements of targets	Ratio	Questionnaire	Descriptive
		Involvement	Percentage of employees involved in the implementation of strategic plan	Ratio	Questionnaire	Descriptive
		Availability	Implementation committee	Ratio	Questionnaire	Descriptive
			Implementation	Ratio	Questionnaire	Descriptive
			Framework document	Ordinal	Questionnaire	Descriptive

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS, INTERPRETATION AND PRESENTATION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the study's findings based on analysis of its primary data. To facilitate ease of dissemination and understanding for the target audience, presentation of findings is done using tables and figures. Moreover, below each statistical presentation relevant explanations and interpretations are given. Presented in this chapter also are the return rate of the questionnaire, the demographic characteristic of respondents and the analysis and interpretation of the findings from the field data collection on the employees of Africa Platform for Social Protection.

4.2 Questionnaire Return Rate

The study received responses from 58 (80.6%) out of the targeted 72 respondents. The response rate of 80.6% was achieved through unflinching support of the management of Africa Platform for Social Protection who encouraged their employees to participate in the study and also appointed three senior program officers to distribute the questionnaires to field officers based in their satellite offices. This is a high response rate and is comparable to previous scholars' works; for example, Cater and Pucko (2010) had a response rate of 49%, Awino (2007) attained 57%, and Aosa (1992) attained 52%. According to Bell (2005), a response rate of 60% is adequate to permit data analysis. The response rate was therefore fit enough for carrying out study analysis.

4.3 Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

The study targeted the employees of Africa Platform for Social Protection, both the full time and semi permanent ones. Respondents to the study were the employees who have been in the organization for at least six months.

4.3.1 Distribution of the Respondents by the levels of Management

The distribution of the respondents in the three levels of management is as shown in Table 4.1.

Table 4 1: Distribution of Respondents by levels of Management

Levels of management	Frequency	Percentage
Low level Management	38	65.5
Middle level Management	16	27.6
Senior level management	4	6.9
Total	**58**	**100**

Majority of the respondents (65.5%) fell under low level management, 27.6% under middle level management while only 6.9 % were from the senior level management.

4.3.2 Distribution of the Respondents by Gender

The researcher sought to establish the gender for the respondents so as to determine if the study was gender sensitive. The results were presented in Table 4.2.

Table 4 2: Respondents Gender

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	32	55.2
Female	26	44.8
Total	**58**	**100**

Table 4.2 shows that majority of the respondents were male (55.2%). However, the difference between male and female respondents is small hence the study was gender sensitive and this was likely to give balanced responses

4.3.3 Distribution of the Respondents by Length of Service at Africa Platform for Social Protection

The respondents were asked to state their years of experience at Africa Platform for Social Protection .The results are as shown in Table 4.3.

Table 4 3: Distribution by Years of Experience

Years of Experience	Frequency	Percentage
6 months to one year	7	12.1
1- 5 years	46	79.3
Over five years	5	8.6
Totals	58	100

Majority of the respondents (79.3%) had worked at APSP for 1-5 years, 8.6% had worked for over 5years, and 12.1% had worked for less than a year.

4.4. Implementation of Strategic plan at Africa Platform for Social Protection

This section presents data on strategic plan implementation at Africa Platform for Social Protection.

4.4.1 Knowledge of Existence of 2012-2015 Strategic Plan

The respondents were asked whether they were aware of the existence of 2012-2015 Strategic Plan. The responses were as shown in Table 4.4

Table 4 4: Awareness of existence of the 2012-2015 Strategic Plan

Documentation	Frequency	Percentage
Number of employees aware of 2012-2015 strategic plan existence	50	86.2
Number of employees not aware of 2012-2015 strategic plan existence	8	13.8
Totals	**58**	**100**

Majority of the respondents (86. 2 %) were aware that a Strategic Plan for 2012-2015 existed. Those unaware of the existence of the strategic plan (13.8%) were mainly from a newly established Africa Platform for Social Protection satellite office based in Mukuru slums, Nairobi.

4.4.2 Knowledge of Strategic Plan Contents

The respondents were asked whether they had read the 2012-2015 Strategic Plan. Table 4.5shows the responses given.

Table 4 5: Knowledge of Strategic Plan Contents

Category of Employees	Frequency	Percentage
Number of employees that had read the plan	22	44
Number of employees that had not read the plan	16	32
Number of employees that started reading but did not finish	12	24
Total	**50**	**100**

Majority of the respondents (56%) had not read the strategic plan. This includes those who started but did not finish. However, 44% of the respondents had read the strategic plan and were well aware of its contents.

4.4.3 Knowledge of the Strategic Objectives

Those who had read and those that had started reading but did not finish reading the 2012- 2015 Strategic Plan were asked to state whether they knew the four years' objectives of the Plan. Table 4.6 presents their responses.

Table 4 6: Knowledge of the Strategic Objectives

Knowledge of strategic objectives	Frequency	Percentage
Employees that knew the strategic objectives	28	82.4
Employees that did not know the strategic objectives	6	17.6
Totals	**34**	**100**

The results in table 4.6 show a large majority of the respondents (82.4 %) that had read the strategic plan knew its strategic objectives while a minority 17.6% did not

4.4.4 Extent of achievement of Objectives

Those that knew the objectives of the 2012-2015 strategic plan were asked to state their opinion on the extent to which the objectives had been achieved. Their responses are as shown below

Table 4 7: The Extent to Which the Strategic Objectives Had been Achieved

The extent to which objectives have been achieved	Frequency	Percentage
75 % of the objectives have been achieved	18	64.3
50 % of the objectives have been achieved	7	25
Less than 50 % of the objectives have been achieved	3	10.7
Total	**28**	**100**

With respect to respondents' opinion on the level of achievement of the 2012-2015 strategic plan ,majority of the respondents (89.3%) who knew the strategic objectives said at least 50 % of the objectives had been achieved, while a paltry 10.7% of the respondents observed that less than 50% of the objectives had been achieved.

4.4.5 Employees involvement in the Implementation of 2012-2015 Strategic Plan

The respondents were asked to state their opinion on the proportion of employees that were involved in the implementation of 2012-2015 Strategic Plan. Their responses are as shown in the Table 4.8.

Table 4 8: Proportion of Employees Involved in the Implementation

Proportion of employees involved in the implementation	Frequency	Percentage
All the employees were involved	20	40
50% of the employees were involved	8	16
Less than 50% of the employees were involved	8	16
Could not tell	14	28
Total	**50**	**100**

Majority of the respondents (56%) thought that at least 50% of the employees were involved in the implementation of the strategic plan while 44% of the respondents either had no clue or thought less than 50% of the employees were involved in the implementation of the 2012-2015 strategic plan.

4.4.6 Establishment of Targets

The respondents were asked whether targets were established to ensure that the strategic objectives were achieved. The responses were as shown in Table 4.9.

Table 4 9: Establishment of Targets

Documentation	Frequency	Percentage
Targets were established	29	58
Targets were not established.	4	8
I do not know	17	34
Total	**50**	**100**

Majority of those interviewed (58%) said that targets were established.

4.4.7 Availability of Resources for the Implementation of the Plan

The respondents were asked to state their opinion on whether Africa Platform for Social Protection had sufficient funds to implement the 2012- 2015 strategic plan efficiently. The responses are as shown in Table 4.10.

Table 4 10: Availability of Financial Resources for the Implementation of the Strategic Plan

Were sufficient funds allocated	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	27	54
No	8	16
I don't Know	15	30
Total	**50**	**100**

While a majority equal to 54 % of the respondents thought Africa Platform for Social Protection had enough financial resources to implement the 2012-2015 Strategic Plan, a whole 46 % either reported in the negative or did not know.

4.4.8 Availability of Qualified Staff for the Implementation of the Plan

The respondents were asked their opinion on whether Africa Platform for Social Protection had enough qualified personnel for the implementation of 2012-2015 strategic plan.

Table 4 11: Availability of Qualified Personnel for the Implementation.

Availability of qualified staff	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	38	76
No	5	10
I don't Know	7	14
Total	**50**	**100**

Majority of the respondents (76%) said that Africa Platform for Social Protection had sufficient number of qualified staff to implement the 2012-2015 Strategic Plan.

4.4.9 Implementation Framework Used

The respondents were asked to state which implementation framework guided the implementation process. The responses are as shown in Table 4.12

Table 4 12: Implementation Framework Used

Implementation framework used	Frequency	Percentage
Balanced Score Card	5	10
Logical Framework	28	56
None	5	10
Any other	2	4
I don't Know	10	20
Total	**50**	**100**

Most respondents (56%) said that the implementation framework used was Logical Framework Matrix, while 20% did not know which implementation framework guided the implementation.

4.4.10 Availability of Implementation Committee

The respondents were asked to state whether there was an implementation committee that oversaw the implementation of 2012-2015 strategic plan. The results are as shown in Table 4.13

Table 4 13: Availability of an Implementation Committee

Availability of an implementation committee	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	25	50
No	8	16
I don't Know	17	34
Total	**50**	**100**

The respondents seemed confused on whether a committee to implement the strategic plan existed. While half of them (50%) said there was an implementation committee, the other half either did not or thought none existed.

4.5 Leadership and Implementation of the Strategic Plan

This section will discuss how leadership influenced the implementation of 2012-2015 Strategic Plan.

4.5.1 Educational Qualification of Leaders Heading the Implementation

The respondents were asked which educational qualifications they thought were necessary for successful implementation of 2012-2015 Strategic Plans. The responses are as shown in Table 4.14.

Table 4 14: Qualification of Leaders Overseeing the Implementation

Educational Qualification	Frequency	Percentage
Masters degree	5	10
Bachelor degree	24	48
A diploma	19	38
I don't know	2	4
Total	**50**	**100**

The cumulative percentage of respondents who thought at least a Bachelor's Degree was necessary for successful implementation of 2012-2015 strategic plan was 58%, showing a high level of education.

4.5.2 Experience of Leaders Heading the Implementation

The respondents were asked whether experience in strategic plan implementation was necessary for successful implementation of strategic plans. The results were as shown in Table 4.15.

Table 4 15: Necessity of Experience in Strategic Plan Implementation

Need for Experience for successful implementation of 2012-2015 Strategic Plan	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	45	90
No	5	10
Totals	**50**	**100**

Most of the respondents (90%) thought that experience was necessary for successful implementation of 2012-2015 strategic plan

4.5.3 Consultation on Implementation

The respondents were asked to state whether Africa Platform of Social Protection had scheduled meetings for consultation and advice on the implementation of 2012-2015 Strategic Plan. The responses were as shown in the Table 4.16.

Table 4 16: Availability of Meetings for Consultation on Implementation

Availability of scheduled Meetings for Consultation and Advice on Implementation	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	42	84
No	5	10
I don't know	3	6
Total	**50**	**100**

Majority of the respondents (84%) said that Africa Platform of Social Protection had scheduled meetings for consultation and advice on strategic plan implementation.

Those who said that Africa Platform of Social Protection had scheduled meetings for advice and consultations were asked how frequently the meetings happened. The results were as shown in Table 4.17

Table 4 17: Frequency of Consultation Meetings

Frequency of Meetings	Frequency	Percentage
Quarterly	35	83.3
Monthly	3	7.1
I don't Know	2	4.8
Each department has its schedule	2	4.8
Total	**42**	**100**

Most of the respondents (83.3%) said that Africa Platform of Social Protection held consultation meetings once every three months.

The respondents that said that there were scheduled meetings for consultation were asked to rate the leaders' attendance of those meetings. The results were as shown in Table 4.18.

Table 4 18: Attendance of Meetings by Leaders of Implementation

Leaders attendance of Meetings	Frequency	Percentage
Very good	15	35.7
Good	27	64.3
Poor	0	0
Total	**42**	**100**

All the respondents rated the leaders' attendance of the scheduled meetings as good or better.

4.6 Communication and Strategic Plan Implementation

This section discusses how communication influenced 2012-2015 Strategic Plan implementations at Africa Platform for Social Protection

4.6.1 Dissemination of the Strategic Plan to All Employees

The respondents were asked whether 2012-2015 Strategic Plan was introduced to all the employees. The responses were as shown in Table 4.19.

Table 4 19: Dissemination of the Strategic Plan to Employees

The plan was introduced to all employees	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	33	66
No	15	30
I don't Know	2	4
Total	**50**	**100**

While the majority (66%) of the respondents said that the plan was introduced to all, 34% of the respondents either answered in the negative or did not know.

4.6.2 Frequency of Strategic Plan Dissemination Sessions

The respondents were asked how frequently sessions were held to disseminate the contents of the 2012-2015 Strategic Plan. The results are as shown in Table 4.20.

Table 4 20: Frequency of Sessions to Disseminate the Contents of the Strategic Plan

Frequency of sessions to disseminate the contents of the Strategic plan	Frequency	Percentage
No such sessions were held	25	50
Less than four times a year	8	16
Four times a year	8	16
Monthly	4	8
I don't know	5	10
Total	**50**	**100**

Majority of the respondents (60%) said that there were no sessions to disseminate the contents of the 2012-2015 Strategic Plan and if such sessions existed they were not aware.

4.6.3 Sessions to Inform Employees of New Responsibilities

Respondents were asked whether Africa Platform for Social Protection organized sessions where employees were informed of the new responsibilities they would assume as a result of the 2012-2015 Strategic Plan. The results are as shown in Table 4.21.

Table 4 21: Sessions to Inform Employees of their New Responsibilities

Availability of sessions informing employees of their new responsibilities	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	26	52
No	24	48
Total	**50**	**100**

Staff members seemed confused on the facts on this issue as they gave contradictory answers almost at equal frequency (52 against 48%)..

4.6.4 Methods Used to Communicate the Strategic Plan Implementation Progress

Respondents were asked to state the methods Africa Platform for Social Protection used to communicate the progress of 2012-2015 Strategic plan implementation to the employees. The results were as shown in Table 4.22.

Table 4 22: Methods Used to Communicate Implementation Progress

Methods Used to Communicate Progress of Implementation of 2012-2015 Strategic plan	Frequency	Percentage
Emails only	2	4
Meetings only	30	60
There was no communication	9	18
Emails and meetings	9	18
Total	**50**	**100**

While most of the respondents said that information was passed through meetings (60%), 18 % of the respondents said that there was no such communication.

4.6.5 Communicating Challenges on Implementation

The respondents were asked to state the methods they used to report the challenges experienced while implementing the strategic plan. The results were as shown in Table 4.23.

Table 4 23: Methods Used to Report Challenges in the Implementation of Strategic Plan

Methods Used to Report Challenges experienced in the Implementation of the Plan	Frequency	Percentage
Meetings with supervisors	30	60
Email	15	30
I don't report	1	2
Progress reports	4	8
Total	**50**	**100**

Most of the respondents used meetings with supervisors (60%) and emails (30%) to report challenges experienced while implementing strategic plans.

4.6.6 Ease of Access to Strategic Plan Document

The respondents were asked how easily they accessed a copy of the strategic plan. The results are as shown in Table 4.24.

Table 4 24: Ease of Accessing Strategic Plan Document

Ease in accessing a copy of Strategic Plan	Frequency	Percentage
It is easy to access a copy	42	84
It is difficult to access a copy	8	16
Total	**50**	**100**

Majority of the respondents (84%) could access a copy of 2012-2015 Strategic Plan easily while 16% of the respondents had difficulties accessing the same.

4.7 Implementation of Strategic Plans and Organization Culture

This section focused on the study objective which sought to determine whether organizational culture influences implementation of strategic plans at Africa Platform for Social Protection

4.7.1 Culture and Implementation of Strategic Plans

This question sought to find out what kind of culture best described the working conditions at Africa Platform for Social Protection (APSP) in relation to implementation of 2012-2015 strategic plan. There were four choices for the perceived conditions including conducive, not conducive, effective and not-effective. The results are as shown in Table 4.25

Table 4 25: Common Culture in relation to Implementation of Strategic Plans

Prevalent culture	Frequency	Percentage
Conducive	21	42
Not conducive	5	10
Effective	15	30
Not effective	9	18
Total	**50**	**100**

From table 4.25, the most common positive condition was "conducive" with 42% while "effective" condition was the next most prevalent with 30%. This indicates that APSP had conducive and effective culture..

4.7.2 Effective versus Non-Effective Culture

Following the response on the conditions of organization culture tabulated in Table 4.25, this question sought to establish possible reasons as to why they thought the culture conditions at

Africa Platform for Social Protection (APSP) were either effective or not effective. However, respondents did not indicate whether the reasons given existed or did not exist at APSP leading the study to use the term "existence" or non-existence in the analysis of that condition. The results were tabulated in Table 4.26 and analyzed using Percentages.

Table 4 26: Reasons for Effective or Non-Effective Culture Conditions

Suggested Reason	Frequency	Percentage
Existence or non-existence of appropriate change environment	6	12
Existence or non-existence of shared policies and work procedures	16	32
Religious background	9	18
Existence or non-existence of rewards for motivation	10	20
Existence or non-existence of good communication and leadership	7	14
Community participation or non-participation	2	4
Total	**50**	**100**

Results indicated that, existence or non-existence of shared policies and work procedures was the most prevalent reason indicated by 32% of respondents.
.

4.7.3 Culture and Achievement of Strategic Objectives

This question sought to find out why the respondents thought their organization culture supports implementation of strategic objectives and the responses were tabulated and analyzed using percentages.

Table 4 27: Why Culture Supports Implementation of Strategic Plans

Suggested Reason	Frequency	Percentage
Supporting communities and a multicultural work teams	10	20
Involvement of stake holders and staff	20	40
A defined culture for support of implementation	8	16
Good communication for sharing values and set objectives	7	14
Rewarding by management for creativity	3	6
Regular training and recognition of professionalism	2	4
Total	**50**	**100**

The results from Table 4.27 indicate that 40% of respondents thought involvement of stakeholders in implementation is a show of supportive culture, while 20% thought supporting communities and using multicultural working teams is a show of cultural support for implementation of strategic plans. Another reason given was presence of a defined culture which was cited by 16% of respondents. However only 6% thought rewarding of employee creativity was a supportive culture for implementation while the least supportive culture was training and professionalism which was only cited by 4% of respondents.

4.7.4 Culture Not Supporting Achievement of Strategic Objectives

In this question, the research sought the opinion of respondents on the reasons why their organization culture did not support achievement of strategic plan implementation and even though the respondents were not very confident to give answers, their responses are tabulated in the Table 4.28 and analyzed using percentages and prose

Table 4 28: Reasons Why Culture Does Not Support Implementation

Suggested Reason	Frequency	Percentage
Rewarding and workload proportions	8	16
Poor political leadership and poor staff attitude	16	32
Group or team work environment not provided	7	14
Improving communication, information flow and training	9	18
Cross-cultural, religious, regional or gender considerations	8	16
Lack of fairness in work allocation	2	4
Total	**50**	**100**

The leading cultural factor was politics and staff attitude which had 32% followed by communication flow at 18% and cross cultural aspects including gender discrimination and religion at 16%. Other aspects of culture not supporting strategic implementation include poor rewarding according to workload at 16% and poor environment for team work or group formation at 14%. The least cited negative factor of culture in implementation of strategies was unfairness in work allocation which had 4% of the respondents.

4.8 Control and Strategic Plan Implementation

This section presents results on the role of control in 2012-2015 strategic plan implementations at Africa Platform for Social Protection.

4.8.1 Policies Supporting the Implementation

The respondents were asked to state whether Africa Platform for Social Protection had policies that supported the implementation of 2012-2015 Strategic plan. The results are presented in Table 4.29.

Table 4 29: Availability of Policies to Support Implementation of the Strategic Plan

Availability of Policies	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	35	70
No	5	10
I don't know	10	20
Total	**50**	**100**

Majority of the respondents (70 %.) said that policies were available to guide the implementation of the strategic plan.

4.8.2 Frequency of Measuring Implementation Against Targets

The respondents were asked to state how often implementation was measured against the set targets. The results were as shown in Table 4.30.

Table 4 30: Frequency of Measuring Performance Against Targets

Frequency of performance measurement against targets	Frequency	Percentage
Quarterly	9	18
Annually	8	16
Implementation was not measured against targets	16	32
I don't know	17	34
Total	**50**	**100**

Majority of the respondents (66%) thought performance was not measured against targets or did not know

4.8.3 Frequency of Reporting the Progress of Implementation

The respondents were asked to state how often the progress of implementation was reported to the project coordinators. The results are shown in Table 4.31

Table 4 31: Frequency of Reporting the Progress of Implementation

Frequency of reporting Progress on Implementation	Frequency	Percentage
Quarterly	21	42
Monthly	11	22
It is not reported	9	18
I don't know	9	18
Total	**50**	**100**

Majority of the respondents (64%) said that the progress of implementation was reported regularly while 36% said either it was not reported or did not know

4.8.4 Adjustment of the Strategic Plan Based on Feedback

The respondents were asked to state whether the 2012-2015 Strategic plan was ever adjusted as a result of the feedback. The results are as shown in Table 4.32

Table 4 32: Adjustment of the Strategic Plan Based on Feedback

Adjustment of Strategic Plan Due to Feedback	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	17	34
No	10	20
I don't know	23	46
Total	**50**	**100**

Thirty four percent (34%) of the respondents said that the plan was adjusted while 66% either said that the plan was not adjusted or did not know.

4.8.4 Relationship between Variables

To determine the degree of relationship between the variables, the researcher performed a Pearson's correlation as illustrated by Table 4.33.

Table 4.33: Pearson's correlation

		Implementation of strategic plan	Leadership	communication	Culture	Control
Pearson Correlation	Implementation of strategic plan	1.00	0.77	0.56	0.52	0.37
	Leadership	0.77	1.00	0.59	0.55	0.35
	Communication	0.56	0.59	1.00	0.55	0.40
	Culture	0.52	0.55	0.55	1.00	0.37
	Control	0.37	0.35	0.40	0.37	1.00
Sig.(1-tailed)	Implementation of strategic plan	1.00	0.00	O.OO	0.00	0.00
	Leadership	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Communication	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
	Culture	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
	Control	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00

Pearson's correlation coefficient(r) is a measure of the strength of the association between the two variables. This enabled the researcher to establish the level to which one variable moved together with the other in explaining changes in implementation of strategic plan. Findings indicate that, the relationship between all the variables (that is, organizational culture, communication, control, leadership as well as implementation of strategic plans) with each other is significant since the significance level at 95% confidence level; one tail test is less than 0.05. Highest correlation was found between strategic leadership and implementation of strategic plan with coefficient factor of 0.77. Others were leadership and organizational culture, implementation of strategic plans and communication, as well as leadership and communication with each a correlation coefficient of 0.55, 0.56, 0.59, respectively.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter outlines a summary of the key outcomes from the study focusing on the issues emerging in relation to the study objectives. The study sought to investigate the factors influencing implementation of strategic plans in NGOs, with special focus on Africa Platform for Social Protection (APSP). Specifically, the study looked at the influence of Leadership, communication, culture and control in implementation of strategic plans at Africa Platform for Social Protection. This chapter summarizes the findings of the study and the statistical analysis. The presentation is organized around specific objectives and research questions to assess the results by evaluating and interpreting them. The chapter also presents discussions and recommendations made from the study, targeting the employees of Africa Platform for Social Protection. The conclusions are in tandem with the specific objectives and research questions.

5.2 Summary of Findings

This section highlights the key findings from the study.

The leaders of Africa Platform for Social Protection were committed to the implementation of the strategic plan and had the necessary leadership skills and experience. They were instrumental in institutionalizing the scheduled meetings for consultation and advice on strategic plan implementation and they attended the meetings as planned.

While most of the employees were aware of the existence of the strategic plan, very few knew of its contents basically because sessions for communication of the content and staff roles in the plan implementation were non-existent or were far and in between. However, there was feedback on implementation of the plan.

APSP was found to show culture aspects in many ways to prove that their success is enshrined in their culture. APSP had conducive and effective culture. The conducive condition favored strategy implementation but the low score for effective condition meant that implementation could not be well achieved. This study demonstrates what scholars like Drucker (1985), Aosa (1992) and Letting (2009) concluded by observing that culture requires a conducive and effective

environment that is supportive of the employees involvement in implementation. The findings also indicated that strategic implementation could be hindered since non-conducive and non-effective conditions do exist at APSP. This was in conformity with findings of Aosa (1992), Arasa (2008) and Awino (2007) that some conditions of culture hindered implementation of strategic plans.

Policies and performance targets to guide the implementation of the Strategic plan exist. However, performance was not measured against targets and many staff members did not know whether or not plan adjustments had been done based on feedback.

5.3 Discussion of Findings

This section presents a discussion of the key findings.

The study established that leaders of APSP were committed to the implementation of the strategic plan and had the necessary leadership skills and experience. They had the key role of mobilization and control of resources needed for effective implementation of the plan. They were also instrumental in institutionalizing the scheduled meetings for consultation and advice on strategic plan implementation and they attended the meetings as planned.

This finding conforms with what has been said by different authors who described leadership as one of the key drivers of effective strategic plans implementation (Noble 1999; Collins 2001; Thompson and Strickland 2003; Kaplan and Norton 2004; Pearce and Robinson 2007;). This also conforms with what scholars such as Thomson have said that managers are responsible for initiating and supervising the execution process in their areas of authority as well as getting the subordinates to continuously improve on how the strategic plan's critical activities are being performed and in producing operating results that allow company's performance targets to be met (Thomson et al 2007).

This study has established that while most of the employees of APSP were aware of the existence of the strategic plan, very few knew of its contents basically because sessions for communication of the content and staff roles in the plan implementation were non-existent or were far and in between. However, there was feedback on implementation of the plan.

While improvement might be necessary in some aspects, the situation at APSP conforms with what various scholars have said that throughout the implementation process, communication should flow bottom-up to allow management to monitor the implementation process and determine whether changes to the approach are needed (Neilson et al, 2008; Beer et al, 2000; Hambrick et al, 1989; Alexander, 1985). The situation at APSP also conforms with what Sterlin said that successful implementation strategic plans need to be demonstrated to the people through regular and effective communication channels. If a person does not understand what has to be done, then he/she cannot own the process and will thus not be able to deliver since no one can apply what they do not properly understand (Sterling 2003).

APSP was found to show culture aspects in many ways to prove that their success is enshrined in their culture. Field results indicated that APSP had successful implementation of plans because she treated culture issues seriously. This corroborates what Aosa (1992) and Awino (2007) both proved that an organization that was successful most probably had a strong culture running through their ranks and systems. APSP had conducive and effective culture. The conducive condition favored strategy implementation but the low score for effective condition meant that implementation could not be well achieved. This study demonstrates what scholars like Drucker (1985), Aosa (1992) and Letting (2009) concluded by observing that culture requires a conducive and effective environment that is supportive of the employees involvement in implementation. The findings also indicated that strategic implementation could be hindered since non-conducive and non-effective conditions do exist at APSP. This was in conformity with findings of Aosa (1992), Arasa (2008) and Awino (2007) that some conditions of culture hindered implementation of strategic plans

APSP established targets to make implementation of the Strategic Plan easy and measurable, however, performance at APSP was not measured against the set targets that would make it possible for APSP to know whether or not the organization was on track and when adjustments were required. Such an action would be in conformity with the study done by Beer and Eisenstat (2007) who have said that translation of vision into clear targets makes it possible to understand the strategic plans by the employees at all the organization levels. It makes them easier to understand the way their everyday work contributes to the performance of the strategic plans when the company targets become, in their opinion, viable.

5.4 Conclusions

APSP has qualified and experienced leaders who are also committed to the implementation of the organization's strategic plan. Through this leadership, most of the employees are aware of the existence of the strategic plan, performance targets and policies to guide implementation. Hence, APSP has to a large extent been successful in implementing its 2012-2015 Strategic Plan and a good proportion of its targets achieved. However, APSP needs to put more effort in disseminating the contents of the plan and informing the staff members of their roles in the implementation. There is need to measure performance against targets regularly. The study also concluded that provision of a conducive environment by APSP made her successful through embracing of a culture that supported team spirit, togetherness and willingness to share and implement goals. This supported successful implementation of strategic plans

5.5 Recommendations

The study recommends the following:

1. APSP should invest more in communicating future strategic plans, including the contents, the progress of implementation and the benefits of implementing the plans. There should be communications regarding strategic plan from vision to completion. Communications should clearly define the role for each employee and programme as well as the targets that need to be achieved if the plan is to succeed.

2. APSP should strengthen control in order to effectively monitor the progress of implementation of strategic plan by measuring implementation performance and taking corrective action regularly.

3. There is need for APSP to work towards self-sustainability to avoid incomplete implementation due to inadequate resources

4. The study also recommended that there should be more research and development (R & D) as this would give APSP an opportunity to clearly understand and review her strategic options with respect to effective implementation.

5.6 Suggestions for Future Research

The following is suggested for further research**:**

1. The influence of organizational structure and stakeholders participation in implementation of strategic plans at APSP

2. The study focused only on the concept of strategy implementation. The concept of strategic planning and other stages should be considered for further study

3. Although data collection was limited to the use of questionnaires, , more robust qualitative methods are recommended for future research

4. The study only used four aspects of an organization namely leadership, communication, culture and control. Other aspects of an organization could be considered in a future research for example training and development, monitoring and evaluation and human resources

REFERENCES

Aaltonen, P. & Ikävalko, H. (2002). Implementing Strategies Successfully. *Integrated*

  Manufacturing Systems, 13 (6), 415 – 418.

Alan, F.(2004). PVO and NGO Futures, A Framework for Reflection and Dialogue

Aldin C. & Caldwell, W. (1991). *Strategy and Human Resource Management*. New York: Free
  Press.

Alexander, J. A. *& Weiner*, B. J. (*1998*). The Adoption of the Corporate Governance Model by
  Nonprofit Organizations. Nonprofit Management *and* Leadership

Alexander, L.D. (1985), Successfully Implementing Strategic Decisions, *Long Range Planning*,
  Volume 18, No. 3, 1985.

Ansoff, H. I. & McDonnell, E .J. (1990). *Implementing Strategic Management.* (2nd ed.).
  Cambridge: Prentice Hall.

Al-Ghamdi, S. (1998). Obstacles to successful implementation of strategic decisions:The British
  experience. *European Business Review*, 98 (6), 322-327.

Allio, M.K. (2005). A short, practical guide to implementing strategy. *Journal of business*
  strategy, *26(4),* 2005

Amabile, C. Okinuwe, S., & Weniyi, R. (1996). Leading through Organizational Change
  Management. *Journal of Management, 3* (1),

Ansoff, H. I. & McDonnell, E .J. (1990). *Implementing Strategic Management.* (2nd ed.).
  Cambridge: Prentice Hall.

Aosa, E. (1992). *An Empirical Investigation of Aspects of Strategy Formulation and*
  Implementation within Large Private Manufacturing Firms in Kenya.
    Unpublished PHD Thesis, Strathclyde University, UK

Arasa, R.M. (2008). *The Challenges of Implementing Strategic Plans in Large Management*
  Consultancies. University of Nairobi: Unpublished PhD thesis.

Arieu R, (2007). Organizational Culture and Leadership, 3rd Edition, Jossey- Bass Publication, Uk.

Atkinson, H. (2006), Strategy Implementation: A role for the Balanced Scorecard, *Management Decision*, *44 (10).*

Awino ZB (2007). *The Effect of Selected variables on corporate performance: A survey of Supply Chain Management in Large Private Manufacturing Firms in Kenya.* University of Nairobi: Unpublished PhD Thesis

Bell, J. (2005). Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques, Thousand Oaks, CA., Sage.

Beer, M Eisenstat (2000), *The Silent Killers of Strategy Implementation and Learning*, Sloan Management Review, 14 (4), 29-40

Bhagrava, S. (2003). *Transformational leadership; value-based management for Indian organisations*. New Delhi: Sage publications

Bull, M. Van (1991), *Successful Strategy Implementation: A Job for the Internal Auditor*? Amsterdam Business School, University of Amsterdam.

Burnes, B. (2004). *Managing change – a strategic approach to organizational dynamics*. (4th ed.). Cambridge: Prentice Hall.

Cater, T., & Pucko, D. (2010). Factors of Effective Strategy Implementation: Empirical Evidence from Slovenian Business Practice. *Journal for East European Management*, Vol.15 (3).

Chimhanzi, J., & Morgan, R. E. (2005). *Explanations from the marketing/human resources dyad for marketing strategy implementation effectiveness in service firms*. *Journal of Business Research, 58*(6), 787-796.

Cole, G.N. (2002), *Management Theory Practice*, 5th Edition, London: MC Grow Hill Publisher:

Deal T.E. & Kennedy, A.A. (2005) Corporate Cultures: The Rites and Rituals of corporate Life, Harmon worth, Penguin Books

Deal, S. & Kennedy, L. (1982). Corporate Cultures: The Roles and Rituals of Corporate Life. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

DeKluyver, C. A. and J. A. Pearce II (2003). Strategy: A View from the Top, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc., 142 pages.

Drazin, R. & Howard, P. (2002). Strategy implementation: a technique for organizational design, *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 34 No.3, pp.465-85.

Drucker, P. F. (1993). *Managing in turbulent times*. London: Routledge.

Evans, R. (2007. The case against strategic management. *Independent School*

Flood,P.C ,Dromgoole T., Carroll, S.J., and Gorman, L. (2000), *Managing Strategy Implementation*. Oxford : Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.

Galpin, T. J. (1998). When leaders really walk the talk: making strategy work through people. *Human Resource Planning,* 21(3), 38-45.

George, J.M. (2000). Emotions and Leadership: The role of emotional intelligence, Human Relations, New York .Sage publications

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

Grundy, T. (1998). „Strategy Implementation and Project Management. *International Journal of Project Management*, 16, 43-50

Guth, W. D., & MacMillan, I. C. (1986). Strategy implementation versus middle management self-interest.*Strategic Management Journal*, 17, 313–327.

Hambrick D.C, Cannella, A.A (1989), Strategy Implementation as Substance and Selling, *The Academy of Management Executive*, Volume 3, No. 4, November 1987.

Harrington, R.J. (2006). *The moderating effects of size, manager tactics and involvement on strategy implementation in food service. Hospitality Management,* **25**, 373-397.

Hauc, A. and Kova,J. (2000). Project management in strategy implementation :Experiences in Slovenia.International .Project Management., 18(1): 61-67.

Hill, J. W. & Jones, G. (2010), Strategic management theory: An integrated approach, 3rd ed. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Hitt, M., Freeman, E. and Harrison, J. (2007). The Blackwell Handbook of Strategic Management. Blackwell Publishing, Oxford.

Hitt, M. A. , Ireland, R. D. , Hoskisson, R. E. (2011). *Strategic Management:Competitiveness & Globalization*, South-Western Cengage, USA

Hofstede, G. (1980, 1991). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*. New York: McGraw-Hill Irwin.

House, R., & Aditya, R. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? *Journal of Management, 23, 409–473*

Hrebiniak, L. G, and Joyce, W.F. (1984), *Implementing Strategy*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Hrebiniak, L.G (2006). Obstacles to Effective Strategy Implementation, Organizational Dynamics, 35, 12-31

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

Judge, S. A., & Robinson, R. D. (2008). Corporate culture's impact on a strategic approach to quality. *Mid-American Journal of Business*, *15* (1).

Kalali, N., Anvari, A., Pourezzat, A., & Dastjerdi, K. (2011). Why does Strategic Plans Implementation Fail? A study in the health service sector of Iran. *African Journal of Business Management, 5 (23), 9831 – 9837.*

Kaplan, R, S., & Norton, D. P. (2005), The Office of strategy Management, Harvard Business Review, (83) (10), 72- 80

Kaplan, R.S., & Norton, D.P. (1992). The balanced scorecard – measures that drive performance. *Harvard Business Review, Vol. 70* No. 1, pp. 71-9.

Kaplan R.S. and Norton, D.P. (1996b.). *Using the Balanced Scorecard as a Strategic Management System.* Harvard Business Review 74 MA.

Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (2000). *The strategy-focused organization – how balanced scorecard companies thrive in the new business environment.* Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Karami A,(2005). *Senior Managers and Strategic Management Process, in Management school.* University of Bradford, UK.

Kombo, D.K. and Tromp, D.L. A. (2006). *Research project and Thesis Writing. An Introduction.* Nairobi. Paulines Publications Africa.

Korten, D. (1990). Non-governmental organizations and management: A feminist perspective. *Women and Language, 28*(1).

Kotter J. (2007). leading change: Why *transformation efforts fail*: Harvard business review.

Kothari, C.R. (2004). Research Methodology, Methods and Techniques, New Age International (P)Ltd.,Publishers, New Delhi

Leting, S. L. (2009). *Leadership in Strategic Management: A Theory of Corporate Governance Emergence.* University of Nairobi: Unpublished PhD Thesis.

Leonarda, J. & Susana, G. (2009). Does Communication Studies Have an Identity? Setting the Bases for Contemporary Research. *Catalan Journal of Communication and Cultural Studies* (Intellect Ltd.).

Louw L, and Venter ,P (2006). *Strategic Management Winning in the Southern African Workplace .* Cape Town : Oxford University Press, Southern Africa.

Marianne, D., Elain D. & Zellei, S. (2011). *Applying Communication Theory for Professional Life*. Sage Publications Inc

Maritan, C. A., & Brush, T. H. (2003). Heterogeneity and Transferring Practices: Implementing flow manufacturing in multiple plants. *Strategic Management Journal, 24, 945–959*

.McClelland J. *(1961). Theory of n-arc leadership.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

McNamara, C. (2008). Strategic Planning (in nonprofit or for-profit organizations). Retrieved July 25 2011   from http://managementhelp.org/plan_dec/str_plan/str_plan.htm#anchor45 3886.

Miller, S. (1999). Implementing strategic decisions: four key success factors. *Organizational Studies*, 18/4, 577 – 602

Miller, S., Wilson, D. and Hickson, D. (2004). Beyond Planning: Strategies for Successfully Implementing Strategic Decisions, *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 37, pp. 201-218.

Miniace, J.N. & Falter, E. (1996). Communication: a key factor in strategy implementation. *Planning Review*, 24, 26-30.

Mintzberg, H. (1994, January-February). The Fall and Rise of Strategic Planning. *Harvard Business Review*.

Mintzberg, H. (2004). In defence of strategy and its survival in changed economies. *Harvard Business Review*

Mugenda , Olive M. and Mugenda A. G.(1999), *Research Methods : Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. Nairobi*:* ACTS Press, Nairobi.

Mugenda, A. & Mugenda, O. (2003). *Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. (4th Ed.). Nairobi: ACTS.

Nachiamas, F, (1996). *Research Methods in Social Sciences*. 5th ed. London, Arnold.

Nachmias, D. A & Nachmias, F.S. (2006). *Social Statistics for a Diverse Society*. (3rd Ed.). Milwaukee, USA: Sage Publications.

Neilson, G.L., Martin, K.L., Powers, E. (2008), The Secrets to Successful Strategy Execution *.Harvard Business Review, Boston Massachusset.*

Noble C. H. (1999), The Eclectic Roots of Strategy Implementation Research. *Journal of Business Research* 45 (2): 119-134.

Nooreklit , H. (2003), The Balance Score Card- A Critical Analysis of Some of its Assumption, *Management Accounting Research, Vol.11, No.1.*

Nutt, P.C. (1986), Tactics of Implementation, *Academy of Management Journal*, 29(2): 230-261.

Nutt, P.C. (1987). Identifying and Appraising How Managers Install Strategy. *Strategic Management Journal,* **8**, 1-14.

Okumus, F. (2003), A Framework to Implement Strategies in Organizations, *Emerald Journal, Management Decision,* Vol. 41 No: No: 9.

Okumus, F. (2001). Towards a strategy implementation framework. International *Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 13, 327-338.

O'Reilly, C. A., Cardick, Z. T., & Newton, M. A. (1991). Seizing the occasion: The Effect of new Management. Stanford University: Research Papers. Osoro

Orodho J. A. (2004): Techniques of Writing Research Proposal and Reporting in Education.Nairobi:Masda publishers.

Orodho, J. A. (2009). *Elements of education and social science research methods.* Maseno:Knezia publishers.

Osoro, D. E. (2009). Agency theory in the not-for-profit sector: its role at independent colleges. Nonprofit and Volunteer Sector Quarterly, Vol. 29 No.2.

Pearce J. A. Robinson R.B. (1997). 59 *Strategic Management Foumulation, Implementation and Control,* 5th edition, Homewood: Irwin Inc.

Pearce, J., & Robinson, R. B. (2002). *Strategic Management Formulation, Implementation and control.* Delhi: Richard D. IRWIN.

Pearce, J. A., & Robinson, R. B. (2004). *Strategic Management: Formulation, Implementation and Control.* (5th Ed.). Homewood, IL: Richard D. IRWIN Inc.

Pearce, J. A. & Robinson, R. B. (2011). *Strategic Management, Formulation, Implementation and control.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Peng, W. and Litteljohn ,D. (2001), Organisational Communication and Strategy Implementation-A Primary Inquiry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality, 13, 360-363*

Peters, D.L., & Waterman, B.C., (1982). *Resourcefulness in guiding strategic level management.* New York: Free Press.

Porter, M., (1996). *Competitive Advantage, Creating and sustaining superior performance.* New York: Free press,

Raffoni, M., (2008), Three Keys to Effective Execution. *Management Update,* 13 Vol. 6.

Raps, A. and Kauffman, D (2005). *Strategy implementation –* an insurmountable obstacle? Handbook of Business Strategy, Volume 6, Number 1, pp 141-146.

Rapert, M. I. & *Wren*, B. M. (*1998*). Reconsidering Organizational Structure: A Dual Perspective of Frameworks *and* Processes, *Journal of Managerial Issues 10(3): 287*

Rapert, M.I, Velliquette   A, and Garretson, J.A. (2002), The Strategic Implementation Process: Evoking Strategic Consensus through Communication, *Journal of Business Research*, No 55: 301-310.

Rashid, M.Z.A., Sambasiavn, M. and AdbulRahman, A. (2004).*The influence of organizational culture on attitudes toward organizational change*, *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal*, Vol. 25 Iss: 2, pp. 161-179.

Schaap, J.I. (2006), Toward Strategy Implementation Success: An Empirical Study of the Role of Senior-Level Leaders in the Nevada Gaming Industry. *UNLV Gaming Research and Review Journal*, No 10, 13-37.

Schein, H. E. (2005). *Organizational culture and leadership.* (2nd Ed.). San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass publishers

Schein, E. H. (1988). Organizational Culture and Leadership. San Francisco: JosseyBass

.Singh, D.T. (1998). Incorporating cognitive aids into decision support systems: The case of the strategy execution process. *Decision Support Systems,* 24, 145–163.

Sterling J. (2003), Translating Strategy into Effective Implementation, Dispelling Myths and Highlighting What Works. *Strategy and Leadership* , Vol 31/3.

Swayne, L., Duncan., W & Ginter, P. (2008).Strategic Management of Healthcare Organization. [sixth ed.].San Franscisco: Jossey--Bass

Thomas, A. (1988). Does leadership make a difference to organizational performance. Administrative Science Quarterly,33, 388–400.

Thompson A., and Strickland A. (1996), *Strategic Management Concepts and Cases*, 11th ed. Mass: McGraw-Hill/Irwin, Boston.

Thompson, A.A. and Strickland, A. (2003). Strategic Management Concept and Cases edition, New York, USA

Thompson A, Strickland A. J ,Gamble E. (2007) ,*Crafting and Executing Strategy*, 15th edition , Mcgraw-Hill International/Irwin , Boston.

Thompson, A.A Jr, Strictland III and Gamble, J.E. (2008). *Crafting and excecuting Strategy: The quest for competitive Advantage, Concept and Cases*. MCGraw Hill/Irwin, New York

Thompson, J. L. (1997). Strategic management: *Awareness and change*. Thompson Business Publishers, 3rd Edition

Trochim, M.K (2006). www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/reltypes.php.Retrieved on 22nd may 2012

Wambui, G. L. (2006). *Managers and Strategy Implementation in NGOs.* University of Nairobi: Unpublished.

Weihnrich, H. & Kootnz H. |(1993). Management: *A global perspective,* MCGraw-Hill, 10th Edition.

Wernham, R., (1985). Obstacles to Strategy Implementation in a Nationalized Industry, *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol 22 (6).

Wolfgang, D. (2006). The Identity of Communication Research. *Journal of Communication (Blackwell Publishing Ltd.; International Communication Association)* 54 (4).

Wooldridge, B., & Floyd, S. (1990). The strategy process, middle management involvement, and organizational performance. *Strategic Management Journal, 11*, 231–241.

Yang, L., Sun, G., & Eppler, M. J. (2008). Making strategy work: a literature review on   the factors influencing strategy implementation. Institute of Corporate Communication

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Introduction Letter

Daniel Wagura Gichohi

Department of Extra Mural Studies

School of Distance and Continuing education

University of Nairobi

Tel: 0722 807830; Email:daniel.gichohi2013@gmail.com

SUBJECT: MASTER OF ARTS IN PROJECT PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT RESEARCH PROJECT

STUDY TOPIC: Strategic plan implementation

STUDY TITLE: Factors influencing implementation of strategic plans; the case of

Africa Platform for Social Protection(APSP)

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am a final year Masters of Arts Student carrying out an academic research for the purpose of examination leading to the award of a degree of Master of Arts in Project Planning and Management.

The purpose of this letter is to request you to participate in my research by providing the required information as per the questionnaire provided. Kindly be as honest and as thorough as possible. The information you provide will be considered as confidential and will only be used for the purpose of my examination. Your response to the questions will be held with utmost confidence and the results will not affect your employment status at APSP. It is your right not to participate in this study if for any reason you are unwilling.

Yours faithfully,

Daniel Wagura Gichohi

L50/68817/2013

Appendix 2: Questionnaire for the Employees of Africa Platform for Social   Protection

A)   GENERAL INFORMATION

Briefly answer the following questions.

1. Your title at APSP ………………………………………………….

2.   Your   gender   Male ☐   Female ☐

3. For how many years have you worked at APSP? ………….

(If the answer to question number 4 is "NO", please do not fill the rest of the Questionnaire.)

B)   STRATEGIC PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

Please tick the most appropriate answer.

1. Do you know that APSP has a strategic plan for the years 2012-2015

A.   Yes ☐   B. No ☐

2. Have you read the 2012-2015 Strategic Plan?

A. Yes. ☐   B. No ☐   C. I started but did not finish ☐

If yes or started but did not finish,

a) Do you know the four years objectives of the 2012-2015 Strategic Plan?

      A. Yes ☐   B. No ☐

b) To what extent have the objectives of the 2012-2015 Strategic Plan been achieved?

A. 75% of targets   ☐

B. 50 % of the targets ☐

C. Less than 50 % of the targets ☐

3. What is the proportion of the employees involved in the implementation of the 2012-2015 Strategic Plan?

Percentage of employees involved	Tick the cell that corresponds with the most appropriate response
All the employees are involved	
50% of the employees are involved	
Less than 50% of the employees	
I don't know	

4. Were there targets established to ensure the achievement of the objectives of the 2012- 2015 strategic plan?

A. Yes ☐   No ☐   don't know ☐

c) If yes, what proportion of the targets has been achieved?

Percentage of the targets achieved	Tick the cell that corresponds with the most appropriate response
100% of the targets	
75 % of the targets	

50 % of the targets	
Less than 50% of the targets	

5. In your opinion, were funds allocated for implementation of projects contained in the APSP 2012-2015 Strategic Plan?

A. Yes ☐   B. No ☐   C. I don't know ☐

6. Does APSP have enough staff members for the implementation of the 2012-2015 Strategic Plan?

A. Yes ☐   B. No ☐   C. I don't know ☐

7. Which implementation framework is being used to implement the 2012-2015 Plan?

A. Balance Score Card ☐   B. Logical Framework ☐

C. None ☐   D. I don't know ☐.   Any other ☐

Please specify………………………………

8. Is there a committee that oversees the implementation of the 2012-2015 Plan?

A. Yes ☐   B. No ☐   C   I don't know ☐

C) LEADERSHIP AND IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLAN

(The leaders include the Executive Director, Programme Manager, Project Coordinators, Supervisors, the Human Resources Development Manager, Research Evaluation and Monitoring Officer, APSP Management Board, and any other person considered a leader in APSP.)

Please tick the most appropriate response and where no choices are given, briefly answer the question.

1. Please indicate the educational qualifications of the staff leading the implementation of the 2012-2015 Strategic Plan.

Qualification	Percentage
At least a bachelor's degree	
A diploma	
Less than a diploma(Please specify)	

What educational qualification do you think would be necessary for leaders for successful implementation of APSP's 2012-2015 Strategic Plan?

………………………………………………………………………………………………

2. Do you think experience is necessary for successful implementation of strategic plans

   A. Yes [ ]   B. No [ ]

3. How many years of experience in strategic plan implementation should a leader have to ensure successful implementation of strategic plans?

………………………………………………………………………………………..

4. Does APSP have scheduled meetings for consultation and advice on the implementation of the 2012-2015 Plan?

A. Yes ☐   B. No ☐

If yes, how frequent are the meetings?

A. Quarterly   ☐

B. Monthly   ☐

C. More frequently   ☐

(Briefly explain how often)…………………

D. There are no scheduled meetings ☐

E. I don't Know   ☐

If yes (No.4) Rate the attendance of meetings to discuss 2012 -2015 Strategic Plan implementation by leaders?

A. Very good. ☐   C. Poor ☐

B. Good ☐

D. COMMUNICATION AND STRATEGIC PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

Tick the most suitable answer.

1. Was the 2012-2015 Strategic Plan introduced to all employees (the Board Members, the Programme Coordinators, Managers, Subordinate Staff and Volunteers)?

A. Yes ☐   B. No ☐

2. How frequent were sessions held to inform members of staff of the contents of the 2012-2015 strategic plan held?

A. No such sessions were held ☐

B. Less than four times per year ☐

C. Four times per year ☐

D. More frequently ☐

(Briefly specify the frequency)

……………………………………………………………………………………………

3. Were there sessions where people were informed of their new responsibilities necessitated by the 2012-2015 Strategic Plan?

A. Yes ☐   B. No ☐   C. I don't know ☐

4. Which methods did the leaders use to communicate 2012-2015 Strategic Plan implementation progress?

A. Email ☐

B. Meetings. ☐

C. There was no communication about the strategic plan ☐

D. Any other ☐

If any other, please specify---

5. How do you report the challenges you experience in the implementation of the Strategic Plan?

      A. Meeting with supervisor   ☐

      B. Email   ☐

      C.I don't report   ☐

      D. Any other   ☐

      If any other, please specify---

6. How easily can you access a copy of the Strategic Plan?

A. It is easily accessible   ☐

B. It is difficult to access a copy   ☐

E) ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AND STRATEGIC PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

1) How would you describe the culture of your organization in relation to implementation of 2012-2015 strategic plan?

Conducive ☐   Not conducive ☐   Effective ☐   Not Effective ☐

If "Effective" or "Not Effective" briefly explain

----

2) Why do you think your organization culture supports achievement of strategic objectives?

_____

3) In what areas do you think your culture does not support achievement of strategic objectives?

_____

4) To what extent do you think organizational culture influences the achievement of the organization's strategic objectives?

Very High ☐   High ☐   Moderate ☐   Low ☐   None ☐

F) CONTROL AND STRATEGIC PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

1. Which of the following framework did you use to implement the Strategic Plan?

A. Logical Framework   ☐

B. Balance Score Card   ☐

C. Other   ☐   Please Specify……………………………….

D. No framework was used   ☐

2. Are there policies to support the implementation of the 2012-2015 Strategic Plan?

    A. Yes ☐   B. No ☐   C.I don't Know ☐

3. Were performance targets established for the 2012-2015 Strategic Plan?

    A. Yes ☐   B. No ☐   C.I don't know ☐

4. Do you know the targets that need to be achieved in order to achieve the objectives of the 2012-2015 Strategic Plan?

A. Yes ☐   B. No ☐   C. I don't know ☐

4. How often is the implementation of the2012- 2015 strategic plan measured against the set targets?

    A. Monthly ☐

B. Quarterly ☐

C. Annually ☐

D. Implementation is not measured against targets. ☐

E. I don't know ☐

5. How frequently is data on progress of the Strategic Plan implementation reported to Project Coordinators?

Frequency of reporting the progress of strategic plan implementation	Tick the row that corresponds with the most appropriate response
Quarterly	
Once every two months	
Monthly	
It is not reported	
I don't Know	

6. Was the 2012-2015 Strategic Plan adjusted as a result of feedback?

A. Yes ☐   B. No ☐   C. I don't know ☐

Thank You