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ABSTRACT

Much of the shortcomings in strategy are attributable to failures in the implementation process rather than in the formulation of strategy itself (Beer et al., 1990; Woolridge and Floyd, 1990). Wessel (1993) stated clearly that most of the individual barriers to strategy implementation that have been encountered fit into one of the following interrelated categories: too many and conflicting priorities, the top team does not function well; a top down management style; inter-functional conflicts; poor vertical communication, and inadequate management development. An increasing number of churches are applying the principles of strategic planning (Clinton et al., 1995). The older and conservative denominations are referred to as the mainstream churches. Their systems ensure that there is accountability and transparency as opposed to those that are run by an individual assuming the roles of both administrator and pastor and include the Roman Catholics, Anglican Church, Presbyterian Church of East Africa, Africa Inland Church, Methodist, Seventh Day Adventist, and Baptist Churches. This research examines to what extent strategic plans are being implemented in the mainstream churches and the challenges of implementing these plans.

A census survey was conducted to establish the strategic implementation challenges and mechanisms to cope with these challenges among the mainstream churches in Kenya. The target respondents were senior pastor(s), the sectional pastors and administrative heads. The study made use of primary data collected using a questionnaire (Appendix III). Descriptive statistics were used to analyze data collected. The first objective of this study was to determine the challenges that face mainstream churches in Kenya results indicating that the greatest challenge rested with organizational culture not supporting strategy implementation, communication of problems to top management, which required their attention as well as competing activities distracting attention from the intended strategy. The second objective was to establish what mainstream churches in Kenya do to cope with strategy implementation challenges and the results showed that use of teamwork was a mechanism highly favored and by most of the churches as well as involvement of stakeholders a popular mechanism with most of the churches.
In conclusion, the level of future success of the churches in Kenya and especially the main stream churches will depend to a greater extent, the level at which they understand the importance of the strategy process for the ultimate direction of the church. There is the need for the implementers of strategies to identify specific benchmarks that the church can use to monitor progress/success in implementing the strategy. From the study it is evident that the way in which strategies implementation challenges were evident in organizational culture and poor communication back to top management were pertinent challenges with popular mechanisms used to cope with the challenges being teamwork and bringing all stakeholders on board in implementation of the strategy.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

In recent years churches have sought to create greater organizational flexibility in responding to environmental turbulence by moving away from hierarchical structures to more modular forms (Balogun and Johnson, 2004; Schilling and Steensma, 2001). Given the intensifying competitive environment among the churches and the constant increase in the number of new churches being formed, it is regularly asserted that the critical determinant in the success and, doubtlessly, the survival of a church is the successful implementation of strategic plans (Bonoma, 1984; Chebat, 1999; Noble, 1999;). Woolridge and Floyd (1990) note, “It can be much easier to think of a good strategy than it is to implement it”. Much of the shortcomings in the strategy are attributable to failures in the implementation process rather than in the formulation of strategy itself (Beer et al., 1990; Woolridge and Floyd, 1990).

Many organizations in both profit and not-for-profit arenas have discovered the benefits of strategic planning. Strategy formulation helps organizations respond to new external challenges by unlocking what they already know about themselves and their markets. The process is an exhilarating one and energizes managers and staff with a new sense of investment in a joint future. However, keeping that energy going in everyday operational realities and measuring the success of strategy implementation is a different matter. An increasing number of churches and ministries are applying the principles of strategic planning (Clinton et al., 1995). In the 1990s, organizations including churches...are playing “jeopardy” if they do not have strategic plans in place. This research examines to what extent strategic plans are being implemented in the mainstream churches and the challenges of implementing these plans. Previous findings discussed later in the research paper indicate that churches implementing their strategic plans experience greater growth in both attendance and finances.
1.1.1 Strategy Implementation Challenges

Wessel (1993) stated clearly that most of the individual barriers to strategy implementation that have been encountered fit into one of the following interrelated categories: too many and conflicting priorities, the top team does not function well; a top down management style; inter-functional conflicts; poor vertical communication, and inadequate management development. These categories can be translated into the following challenges encountered in the implementation of strategies: competing activities distracted attention from implementing this decision; changes in responsibilities of key employees were not clearly defined; key formulators of the strategic decision did not play an active role in implementation and the problems requiring top management involvement were not communicated early enough.

Strategy implementation is the action phase of the strategic process, which includes strategy formulation, analysis of alternative strategies and the choice of strategy adopted. Echoing the words of Field and Keller (1998) strategy implementation is the process through which the organization chosen and intended strategic~ are made to happen. Implementation is similar to execution of a strategy where important activities in this phase are communicating with management, clients, users and other stakeholders; reviewing the progress, monitoring costs, controlling quality, issuing orders for change and managing the change process. It has been assumed that when a company finds that the chosen strategy has not produced the right outcome, the strategy was wrong and fail to recognize that the problem lies in its implementation. Poor implementation leads to a change in a perfectly appropriate strategy leading to inefficient management.

There is fundamental disconnect between formulation of strategies and their implementation to useful action (Hussey, 1998). Hussey continues to stress the point that implementation of strategy is a complex task thus met with a lot of opposition from all quarters that would rather maintain the status quo. Important questions to ask when faced with the challenge of implementing a strategy are how the strategy will actually be implemented in terms of the steps to be taken; how should the organization’s structure be
organized and designed to ensure that both happen; how should the resources be deployed and managed and management of the risk. Success of the strategy requires that the structure and strategy needs' be matched and are supportive of each other. Information systems need to be adequate for reporting back and evaluative purposes. Implementation is not just about the systems but the people involved as well as they will trigger change to some extent either incrementally or drastically. Implementation of strategy involves change, which means uncertainty and risk, which should be planned for and consequently managed (Thompson and Martin, 2005). Implementation and change management go hand in hand due to the course they take in the entire strategic process. As an organization tends to implement its strategy there is no doubt that change is inevitable (DeWit and Meyer, 2004).

1.1.2 Main Stream Churches in Kenya

The Constitution of the Republic of Kenya (CAP 3A) provides for freedom of religion, belief and opinion and this is respected in practice. The Government generally does not infringe upon religious activities, except to require registration under the Societies Act by filling forms and attaching the church's constitution and list of officials. In Kenya, there are very many churches with a sizeable Christian community, a reflection of the freedom of worship that is enshrined in Kenya's constitution. It is said that Kenya is over 80% Christian and with a population of Kenya estimated at 35 million this means the church population in Kenya is 28 million Christians. There are over 4,000 registered churches! (Accessed from www.kenyaspace.com downloaded on 26th June 2007). The older and conservative denominations are referred to as the mainstream churches. The systems ensure that there is accountability and transparency as opposed those that are run by an individual assuming the roles of both administrator and pastor. They are the Roman Catholics, Anglican Church, Presbyterian Church of East Africa, Africa Inland Church, Methodist, Seventh Day Adventist, and Baptist Churches. Lately however, Kenya has witnessed the mushrooming of what are referred to as Evangelical churches with examples the Deliverance Churches of Kenya, Neno Evangelism Ministries, Kuna Nuru Gizani Ministries, The Happy Churches of Kenya, Faith Evangelistic Ministries, Jesus Celebration Centre Ministries, The Redeemed Gospel Church, Jesus is Alive Ministries and Winners
Chapel International Ministries, among others. Charismatic movements have mushroomed in many different shapes and sizes all over the world including Kenya, which has witnessed a phenomenal growth to date due to factors responsible for this growth ranging from a deteriorating socio-political and economic environment. Main Stream churches in Kenya dated back from 1894 with the first Church Missionary Society missionary, Dr. Lugwig Krapf visiting East African to spread the Gospel of Jesus Christ with churches such as the Anglican Church of Kenya (ACK) dating back to 1904 (Cathedral Church of All Saints, 2007), while the Catholic Church is over 100years (Archbishop Ndingi Mwana’a Nzeki, 2003).

1.2 The Research Problem

The mainstream churches’ contribution to the political, socio-economic factors in the country cannot go unnoticed. Programmes ranging from orphanages, HIV/AIDS programs, tribal clashes and civil strife’s, corporate governance and national disaster management. The mainstream churches have proved to be a powerful voice in Kenya thus sought after in matters of governance. They continue to contribute greatly to National Leadership as leaders and models to the national Christian community in areas of public worship, Christian nurture, governance, church administration, including national and global missing engagements, socio-political and civic responsibility (Cathedral Church of All Saints, 2007) The church is looked upon by political leaders and the civil society to determine and judge national concerns calling for bold positions on various social and political concerns as well as economic matters on poverty alleviation. With the dawn of independence in 1963, Africanization of the mainstream churches took key precedence when African Archbishops were enthroned. Virtual Africanization of church leadership embraced the national agenda and adapted its delivery of services to congregants.

Strategy implementation has been extensively discussed (e.g. Awin, 2001; Aosa, 1992; Koske, 2003; Muthuiya, 2004; Ngumo, 2006; Parsitau, 2006; Obwoige, 2006) and continues to attract a lot of attention due to the enormous challenges faced. The church is an important institution in society as it is expected to be at the forefront in dealing with contemporary issues besides spiritual matters. However they too exist in an environment
and face the same challenges a profit-making institution faces. Obwoge, (2006) continues to argue that in recent times churches have adopted strategic management practices; a paradigm shift of the institution. Christian organizations are characterized by both human (organizational) and godly (spiritual) attributes and need to manage their affairs using accepted business models while pursuing spiritual goals and objectives as put by Ngumo (2006). The level of future success of the churches in Kenya and especially the mainstream churches will depend to a greater extent, to the level at which these churches understand the importance of the strategy process for the ultimate direction of the church.

In recent years organisations have sought to create greater flexibility in responding to environmental turbulence (Balogun and Johnson, 2004; Schilling and Steensma, 2001) and given the intensifying competitive environment, it is regularly asserted that the critical determinant in the success and, doubtlessly, the survival of the firm is the successful implementation of its strategic strategies (Bonoma, 1984; Chebat, 1999; Noble, 1999). Martins and Toledo (2000) remark that possible causes of failure of the majority of organisations in the implementation process of their strategic plans are due to the inadequacy of the organisations understanding and effectively addressing those challenges. The research therefore seeks to find out, what strategic implementation challenges face the mainstream churches in Kenya and what the churches have done to cope with these challenges?

1.2 The Research Objectives

(i) To determine strategic implementation challenges that face mainstream churches in Kenya.

(ii) To establish what mainstream churches in Kenya do to cope with strategy implementation challenges.
1.4 Importance of the Study

This study will be important to all existing church organizations both local and international interested in ensuring growth and sustainability in order to enable them develop and sustain competitive advantage in a changing environment. The findings of this study are hoped will assist the management of churches to realize the need for and to come up with strategic plans and ensure their proper implementation for growth of their church as well as up-coming churches. The findings will also be useful to the non-mainstream churches as they seek to find ways of survival in their environment.

Another important aspect of this study is that it may also enable stakeholders make well informed decisions based on management and allocation of church resources. They include the church members, the staff members, the surrounding communities, the government, and the universal church community. Thirdly, the mainstream churches of Kenya can establish effective implementation processes of their strategic plans and share their ideas with other churches, non-profit organizations, learning institutions and be the example other institutions are looking up to.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

Various researchers and writers with reference to the business sector have extensively covered the subject of strategic formulation and implementation. It is now becoming more common to find writers that have applied these principles to nonprofit organizations, including churches. Strategic formulation and implementation is becoming more popular in churches as they seek ways to improve their ministries and to provide direction (Clinton et al., 1995). Church leaders however are finding that they lack the skills and knowledge to implement the planning process. A survey of church pastors conducted to identify the continuing education needs of pastors in the areas of leadership and management skills identified strategic planning as the highest rated topic (Stevens et al., 1996). The same definitions of strategic management that are used in the business sector can be applied to not for profit organizations.

2.2 The Concept of Strategy and Strategy Implementation

Pearce and Robinson (1994), define strategy as large scale, future-oriented plans for interacting with the competitive environment to optimize achievement of organizational objectives. Strategy is 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 fulfill stakeholder expectations (Johnson and Scholes, 2003). According to Mintzberg (1994), strategy is presented as a plan, ploy, pattern, position and perspective and some of their interrelationships are then considered. The corporate strategy should be the marketing strategy, for without a market there is no purpose for the corporation and no role for a corporate strategy, which would not deny any claim that the corporate strategy takes a broader view than the firm’s activities in the market place (Johnson and Scholes, 2003). Since strategic decisions influence the way organizations respond to their environment, strategy is a fundamental planning process. Porter (1985), defines strategy as positioning a business to maximize the value of the capabilities that distinguishes it from competitors. Thompson and Stickland
(1987), define strategy as the game plan management has for positioning the company in its chosen market arena, competing successfully, pleasing customers and achieving good performance. Strategy can be defined as the approach, grand design, plan, policy, procedure or program of action deliberately taken in order to achieve a specific goal. Juach and Glueck (1988), assert that strategy is a unified comprehensive and integrated plan that relates the strategic advantages of the firm to challenges of the environment and that is designed to ensure that the basic objectives of the enterprise are achieved through proper execution by the organization.

Strategy selects the businesses the organization is to be in or is in, determines and reveals the organizational purpose in terms of long-term objectives, action programs and resource allocation priorities, attempts to achieve long-term sustainable advantage in each of its businesses by responding properly to the opportunities and threats in the firm's environment and the strength and weaknesses of the organization. It is a coherent, unifying and integrative pattern of decisions, engaging all the hierarchical levels of the firm (corporate, business, and functional), and defines the nature of the economic contributions it intends to make to its stakeholders. According to (Porter, 1995), a strategy is a description of the manner in which a company or enterprise intends to gain a competitive advantage. Strategies should allow the enterprise to gain a relative advantage through measures its competitors will find hard to follow and allow the advantage to be extended even further. Organizations operating in a highly competitive market must be able to develop and operationalize business strategy incorporating product and service differentiation or other alternatives of generic competitive strategies to gain a competitive advantage in the market place.

2.3 Factors and Challenges in Strategy Implementation

The business news is filled with stories of corporate failure. From the recent dot.com busts to the once powerful companies whose fortunes have slipped, these unhappy endings are often the result of one thing: good strategies gone bad with the underlying cause being poor execution. Without an executable plan and the resources needed to implement the plan even the most innovative strategy is merely words on paper. When leaders of a
church create strategies, the best minds in the organisation come together and devote their time, energy and effort to identify ways to outplay the competition, win market share and increase shareholder value - all tough challenges. Yet despite this focus, most of the times they fail to deliver on the strategy - at the implementation stage. Robbins and Coulter (1996) have taken into consideration that no matter how effectively a company has planned its strategies, it could not succeed if the strategies were not implemented properly. Harrison (1996) also clarified that the more ineffective the top management decisions, the more ineffective are the choices made at lower levels of management. Similarly, if top management's strategic choices tend to be successful, it reflects favorably on choices made in other parts of the organization.

Successful implementation means taking the right action. The creation of strategy can be an uplifting experience. It helps us clarify who we are, what we want, where we want to go and how are we going to get there. All this activity, however, leads to one thing - acting upon the decisions we make. Without any action, our decisions remain as decisions. Shemenhorn (1989) determined that the strategy implementation process included the many components of management and had to be successfully acted upon to achieve the desired results. Here, the critical point is that effective and successful strategy implementation depends on the achievement of good "fits" between the strategies and their means of implementation. Effective strategy implementation requires the existence of a structure and culture in which constant change is regarded as necessary rather than being an exception. A large number of methodologies have been developed over the years on different facets of strategy implementation. However, only a few organizations succeed in translating these methodologies into measurable performance results (Feurer, et al, 1995).

2.3.1 Leadership

The pastor as the leader of a church is the most logical choice to perform the strategy implementation function. To be a successful leader, the pastor should incorporate the creation of a focused vision or mission; clearly communicate the implicit and explicit meanings, and trust in the people who can accomplish it (Bennis, 1985). George (1992) likens the pastor of a church to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) in a business
organization. The CEO’s major influence comes through vision casting. A study conducted by Keggin (1991) explored the interaction between ministry success and the presence of leadership and management skills (including planning) in pastors. His findings indicated that there was a significant correlation between effective ministries and pastors who have been trained in and have applied management and leadership skills.

2.3.2 Structure
A relatively neglected area in strategy implementation is the link between strategy and structure of the firm. There is no best way to structure a firm as it all depends on the situation facing the firm; is it large or small; the environmental turbulence; product range among other pertinent factors. The structure-strategy factor addresses the following two issues: once the strategic plan has been formulated how should the firms’ activities be decided and how will they be allocated to groups or teams to allow for a successful implementation. Secondly, how will the activities be coordinated to achieve a successful strategy implementation process? An organization can be divided into five parts depending on its variables. The strategy apex which controls the organization and is accountable for its performance, the operating core to deliver the basic mission or task; the middle management who manage and supervise, the techno-structure who analyze and help bring about coordination and standardize the process and finally the support staff whose activity is to support the main work of the organization. The contingent variables are what link the strategy and the structure (Bowman, 1998).

2.3.3 Culture
Organizational culture is another of the factors to contend with during strategy implementation. The attitude of “the way we do things around here” is a stumbling block to an organizations ability to implement its strategy. If a change in strategy requires certain behavior that runs counter to the prevailing beliefs, this then represents a serious barrier to strategy implementation resulting to inappropriate process outcomes. Culture is of interest to strategy formulation and implementation because of its influences. The cultural process which is categorized as grouping, informal and formal power, relationships, control and reward systems, management style, stories and symbols. An
understanding of the organizations culture can be a source of advantage by understanding its complexity and therefore the ability to nurture what is good about the culture, the barriers and then replicate and promulgate cultural ‘best practice’ as the organization expands (Bowman, 1998).

2.3.4 Resources
The church has a limited amount of resources with which to address these directives. A church must have a well-defined mission and a set of basic objectives in order to allocate their resources efficiently. Looking inwardly at resources, risks building a company that achieves excellence in providing products and services that nobody wants while a successful strategy comes from matching competencies to the market (Brown et al, 2005). These are basic factors of production involved in the creation of a product or service. Thus materials, machinery, technology, location, premises, labor, brands and reputation may all be regarded as resources useful to strategy implementation (Bowman, 1998). Resources may be imitated and in rare cases may not be: for instance a strong brand name, which mainstream churches capitalize on is difficult to replicate by others. A resource easily replicated cannot generate long-term competitive advantage. The Resource Based View (RBV) identifies four characteristics referred to as isolating mechanisms make resources difficult to imitate: physically unique resources like location; path dependent resources which are created over time; casual ambiguity where it is difficult for competitors to know exactly how a firm has created the advantages it enjoys and by how resources are combined for competitive advantage and economic deterrence which involves large capital investments in capacity to provide products and services. Resources represent the strength and weaknesses of a firm (Pearce and Robinson, 2005).

2.3.5 Teamwork and Team Development
Castka et al. (2001) provide critical analysis of teamwork, and have suggested that teams are necessary for developing and maintaining a well-focused implementation of organizational plans. Teamwork represents an interdependent balance between personal preferences of the individual and the needs of an organisation (Kets De Vries, 1999). People will only contribute to the team if their personal preferences will be recognized first
(Robbins and Finley, 1996). Additionally, appropriate indicators must measure changes in team performance. Zairi (1994) comments that a team approach should be “measured through the voice of process”. Zairi also recommends measuring the team performance through people productivity and contribution to the team through their individual tasks. This means that the implementation of strategic plans can only be achieved if there is total involvement of all within the organization. Communication can represent the difference between failure and success. Effective communication includes maintaining enthusiasm, employees’ full involvement, understanding roles and responsibilities in processes and bringing out the best in people in order to enhance their capabilities (Thiagrajan and Zairi, 1997). Teams are capable of developing more creative solutions to problems than individuals can as Juran (1989) suggests that they are responsible for defining the mission of each of their processes, defining the micro-processes involved and co-coordinating the planning, implementation, control and improvement of processes. It is therefore important that indicating successful communication and awareness of the plans is best facilitated through teams and team working.

2.3.6 Process mapping

Many companies fail to understand the processes because of unclear workflow (Bamber and Sharp, 2000). They often find out that a simple task runs for some unpredictable reason through different departments and hence it is hard to record it. It is important to stay determined and to see that any “ambiguities” within process are actually pointing at possible potential to correct errors that run through process. The identification and management of processes in an organisation has been discussed by Fraser (2001) as an essential interpretation of the ISO 9001 standard, indicating that process mapping itself is not sufficient but is an essential start point for high quality performance. The need for visualizing processes prior to its implementation and for the ideal process should be identified.
2.3.7 Change Management

Organizational inertia refers to the force that needs to be exerted on a body to overcome its state in relation to its motions. Willingness to change may depend upon the organization's culture, existing structure, product, market positioning and the organization's age. Kurt Lewin's three-step model of understanding change has been quoted by Campbell (2002) as the process of unfreezing the current processes, moving to new processes and then refreezing the new processes allowing for new measures to be introduced, take place and take root in the internal systems. Change management maybe approached by the managerialist approach, which begins with education and communication, then negotiation and participation and to some degree coercion. The change agent approach also referred to as the champion of change is managed from beginning to end by an individual. The change agent is a tangible form of change and in most cases an expert in his field.

The effective and efficient management of the change initiative is essential for the successful implementation of plans. Managing change, is concerned with changing peoples' behavior and it has been said that people do not object to change per se, but object to change being imposed on them (Clarke, 1994). Therefore, establishing a shared purpose (or vision of the future) with all stakeholders of the organisation will reduce resistance to the change initiative. Likewise, clearly defined roles and responsibilities at each stage of the planning and implementation requirements are essential when aiming for a high performance organisations' shared purpose and improve the success of the ultimate implementation of strategic plans (McQueen, 1999).

2.3.8 Stakeholders

These are the influential individuals and groups to the strategy process, which by definition means that a change in one component ultimately affects other components. They include the owners, employees, customers, suppliers, governments, unions, competitors, local communities and the general public. Each stakeholder has a different claim to the firm ranging from social responsibility, to satisfaction, appropriate return on investment, adherence to legislation and better quality of products (Pearce and Robinson, 2005).
Stakeholders have influence on strategy development and implementation of an organization depending on the power of each stakeholder. They depend on the organization to fulfill their own goals and on whom, in turn; the organization depends for its success. Stakeholders can be divided into three types depending on their nature; market environment stakeholders, social/political environment and technological environment. Their expectations in many cases will conflict therefore stakeholder mapping to identify expectations and power will help in understanding the political priorities the likely reactions to strategy formulation and ultimately its implementation and the ability to manage these reactions (Johnson et al, 2005).

2.3.9 Environmental Issues

A firm's environment is divided into several layers which are the macro environment, the industry/sector, competitors and the organizational environmental. With the onset of strategic implementation there is an impact on each layer. The key drivers of change need to be understood and differential impact involved (Johnson et al, 2005). Key issues in the environmental economy as discussed by Pearce and Robinson (2005) are the society and demographics in terms of values, attitudes towards marriage, child-bearing, lifestyle, work, religion, sex roles, retirement and racial equality on the firms environment. Ecology, which refers to nature, politics with regard to legislation, and technology with reference to how new products or services are likely to affect implementation of strategies. The operating environment however is affecting by the customer profiles and market change, supplier relationships, labor market, and creditors.

2.3.10 Performance Measurement

Performance of an organisation is commonly assessed against the mission statement in the strategic plan of that organisation; for instance an organisation that has reached its mission is considered a high performing organisation, while it is recognized that most organizations are striving to become a high performing organisation. The key processes of an organization are those that are key to delivering the mission and goals, thus high performance. Likewise, data derived from these processes should be monitored through
Key Performance Indicators in order to demonstrate levels of performance. The difficulty to identify the appropriate and accurate measurements are often as difficult as reaching the goal itself. The important point is to know whether there has not been a progress towards the goal. To verify successful identification of the performances, an organisation has to develop an ongoing process (cycle) to measure, analyze, and re-evaluate results of the performance data as to how the strategies are being implemented (Sanger, 1998).

2.4 Strategy Implementation Responses

In response to environmental challenges a firm needs to consider the implications it will have on the two major categories; strategic and operational as discussed in the section below.

2.4.1 Strategy Response

Top-level management is responsible for the formulation of long-term decision making from a period of about five years and over and made to oversee the long-term future of the firm. They are two major levels which strategy maybe undertaken namely corporate level and business level.

2.4.1.1 Corporate Level

De Geus a Dutch executive with Shell for thirty-eight years, in his book The Learning Organization in 1997 as quoted by Koch (2006), he explored the idea that companies are ‘alive’ and most only live for forty to fifty years and then die because the management focus on economic activities and forget about the community of humans. Corporate strategy is about guiding the evolution of a firm, determining its’ character and leadership and finding ways to make it appeal to customers and increase value to both owners and customers. Corporate strategy is a game of imagination, the gift of inducing profitable collaboration (Koch, 2006). Johnson and Scholes (2005) have discussed the corporate level to refer to the level of management above the business level and has no direct interaction with buyers and competitors. At these level the structure, culture and leadership are crucial factors to strategy implementation and if not managed well can prove
to be a challenge to the implementation process. Changes maybe imposed upon these factors and therefore if embraced by the top level management can expedite the strategy implementation process with minimal resistance.

2.4.1.2 Business Level

At this level the concern is competing and succeeding in the market place. Scholars have advanced several models on how to compete and the ones mentioned in this study are that of Michael Porter’s generic strategies and Ingor Ansoff’s growth penetration. The competitive strategy in an organization is created in the separate business units of a firm. The business units compete in different markets where customers have different needs and requirements. Three main elements as argued by Johnson (2005) are first the bases of competition which includes differentiation strategies, hybrid and focus strategies; secondly, achieving competitive advantage and sustainability of strategy over time and thirdly is the detailed choice of development directions and methods within the more generic choices such as new markets, new products, acquisitions or strategic alliances. Porter’s generic strategy framework as quoted by Campbell (2002), argues that an organization must make two key decisions on its strategy. Is the strategy to be of differentiation or cost leadership and secondly is the scope of the strategy if it is narrow or broad. Figure I shows a cost focus and differentiation as two extremes of a continuum since a strategy can exist in between. An organization can map itself on the continua as well as those in the industry to get an idea where intense competition will occur.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Scope</th>
<th>Low Cost</th>
<th>Differentiation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broad</td>
<td>Cost Leadership</td>
<td>Differentiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Cost Focus</td>
<td>Differentiation focus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure I: The Generic Framework  
Source: Campbell (2002, p 160)
Igor Ansoff’s product-market framework is most commonly used for analyzing the possible strategic response of a firm as shown in Figure II below. Potential areas for core competencies and generic strategies can be deployed into the four broad alternatives; market penetration, market development, product development and diversification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Markets</th>
<th>Products</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Market Penetration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(increased market share)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Market Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(new customers or market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>segments)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure II: The Ansoff Matrix - Growth Vector Components  
Source: Campbell (2002, p 175)

Strategy development and implementation has risks when development requires entry unrelated markets though these will depend on the business assessment of the opportunities compared to opportunities in the current market (Campbell, 2002).

2.4.2 Operational Response

Operational strategy is important to achieving business goals and gaining competitive advantage. It is central to the strategy implementation. Operational response is important in providing ‘strategic fit’ in focusing efforts and resources so that operations strategy is consistent with the business strategy already devised. Operational strategy can be used in a more approach where operational capabilities are viewed as part of the core capabilities/competencies to be exploited and used to create new opportunities and target new areas. Operations therefore are not necessarily restricted to the implementation stage but also the planning stage. Decisions about the future strategy of the organization are made by people and strategies are implemented by people therefore how those decisions will be implemented will depend on the human resource of the firm. The important
question to ask is who, how and why people are doing what they are doing and what they should do in strategic implementation human resources add value to the strategy process but, conversely can make spectacular errors some costly to organization. In regard to the operational response, gaps maybe closed by training and development, recruitment, redeployment, or redundancy. Each solution has financial and time implications (Campbell, 2002).

11 Target Population
The study population of interest for this study consisted of mainstream churches in Kenya. These are seven mainstream churches: namely Roman Catholic, Anglican Church, Presbyterian Church of East Africa, Africa Inland Church, Methodist, Reformed Day Adventist and Baptist Churches. (Accessed from www.kenyaplace.com downloaded on 29th June 2007). The target respondents were senior pastor(s), theotional pastor and administrative heads. Four persons from the seven denominations were approached for data collection bringing to a total of twenty-eight respondents.

1.3 Data Collection
The study used a mix of primary sources. Primary data was collected using a questionnaire (Appendix B), which was administered to the respondents. It was divided into three sections; Section A containing demographic information on the respondents and the church, Section B containing background information on the strategy process. In Section B mention of the challenges on the strategic implementation process and the specific challenges faced were addressed and Section C was the recommendations used to cope with strategy implementation challenges in the various churches.

1.4 Data Analysis
The nature of the data collected were quantitative with yes or no questions to give and option of no answers not addressed in the question. Descriptive statistics were used
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

A census survey was conducted to establish the strategic implementation challenges and mechanisms to cope with these challenges among the mainstream churches in Kenya. A census survey was chosen because the population is small in number and therefore an objective study could be undertaken by collecting data from all the objects. The design also ensured that no element was left to chance and highest accuracy was obtained.

3.2 Target Population

The study population of interest for this study consisted of mainstream churches in Kenya. There are seven mainstream churches, namely Roman Catholics, Anglican Church, Presbyterian Church of East Africa, Africa Inland Church, Methodist, Seventh Day Adventist, and Baptist Churches. (Accessed from www.kenyaspace.com downloaded on 26th June 2007). The target respondents were senior pastor(s), the sectional pastors and administrative heads. Four persons from the seven denominations were approached for data collection bringing to a total of twenty-eight respondents.

3.3 Data Collection

The study made use of primary sources. Primary data was collected using a questionnaire (Appendix III), which was administered to the respondents. It was divided into three sections; Section A containing demographic information on the respondents and the church, requiring some background information on the strategy process. In Section B awareness of the challenges on the strategic implementation process and the specific challenges faced were addressed and Section C was on mechanisms used to cope with strategy implementation challenges in the various churches.

3.4 Data Analysis

The nature of the data collected was quantitative with one open ended question to give and option of to cover a matter not addressed in the questions. Descriptive statistics were used
to analyze data collected. This involved the use of means, standard deviations, percentages and frequencies to measure and compare the results. Data was also presented using suitable presentation tools such as pie charts, bar charts and tables where applicable.

The study deals with the analysis and interpretation of findings of the study, *Strategy Implementation Challenges in The Mainstream Churches in Kenya*. An analysis of the questionnaires distributed to the seven mainstream churches did this. Part A of the questionnaire focused on the demographic information of the respondents and background information on the churches strategy implementation process. Part B presented information on strategy implementation challenges faced by the church and the extent to which each challenge affected the implementation of the strategy. The third section of the analysis Part C presented data on the mechanisms that have been used to cope with strategy implementation challenges and the extent of the success of these mechanisms.

A total of 24 questionnaires were received from the respondents out of the total number of 26 questionnaires circulated to the churches considered as the mainstream churches in Kenya. This formed 89.7% of the targeted population for the study. This study considered a context wherein the number of recorded mainstream churches was only seven with four questionnaires distributed to each of the mainstream churches.

4.2: Profile of Respondents

The characteristics of the respondents who participated in the study related to gender, age, highest level of education and the length the respondent has been with the church and background information on the existing strategy implementation process.

4.2.1 Gender

From the questionnaires distributed to the respondents 17 were received from the female respondents alone, while the remaining 17 questionnaires were received from the male respondents. The data as presented in Table 1, demonstrates that of the questionnaires received, the larger proportion of respondents from the mainstream churches in Kenya are male, with only 20% of the sample being females.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction
This chapter deals with the analysis and interpretation of findings of the study, Strategy Implementation Challenges In The Mainstream Churches In Kenya. An analysis of the questionnaires distributed to the seven mainstream churches did this. Part A of the questionnaire presented the demographic information of the respondents and background information on the churches strategy implementation process. Part B presented information on strategy implementation challenges faced by the church and the extent to which each challenge affected the implementation of the strategy. The third section of the analysis Part C, presented data on the mechanisms that have been used to cope with strategy implementation challenges and the extent of the success of these mechanisms.

A total of 24 questionnaires were received from the respondents out of the total number of 28 questionnaires circulated to the churches considered as the mainstream churches in Kenya. This formed 85.7% of the targeted population for the study. This study considered a census, as the number of recorded mainstream churches was only seven with four questionnaires distributed to each of the mainstream churches.

4.2. Profile of Respondents
The characteristics of the respondents who participated in the study related to gender, age, highest level of education and the length the respondent has been with the church and background information on the existing strategy implementations process.

4.2.1 Gender
From the questionnaires distributed to the respondents 7 were received from the female respondents duly completed while the remaining 17 questionnaires issued were received from the male respondents. The data as presented in Table 1, demonstrates that of the questionnaires returned filled in, the larger proportion of respondents from the mainstream churches in Kenya (70.8%) were male, and the remaining 29.2% were female.
Table 1: Gender of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, 2007

4.2.2 Age

The personnel involved in the management of the various churches and church activities were asked to indicate their age within the various age ranges. The results in Table 2 reveal that the majority of the respondents were in the age groups of between 36 - 50 years with 33.3% falling in this age group. This implied that most of those in the management of church activities were mostly adults of the middle ages between 36-50 years consisting of 83.3%.

Table 2: Age of the respondents used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age in Years</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, 2007
4.2.3 Highest level of education attained

Respondents were asked to indicate the highest level of education that they had attained. Table 3 indicates that 58.3% of the respondents interviewed had completed at least a university degree. Comparing the respondents in respect to their highest level of education attained, more male respondents (70.6%) of the total interviewed and 28.6% of female respondents had attained the minimum university level of education. The level of education one has attained is expected to reflect the quality of work and the understanding of instructions.

Table 3: Respondents Level Of Education Attained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest level of education attained</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A' level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, 2007

4.2.4 Duration Worked For At The Church

The majority of the respondents in this study stated that they had been in the service of their churches for duration of over 1 year with only 8.3% of the respondents having been in the respective churches for less than a year. Table 4 indicates that 33.3% of the respondents had stayed at the service of the churches for a period of over ten (10) years and 40.8% of the respondents have been in the service of the churches for period between 5 – 10 years.
Table 4: Duration of Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DURATION</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>below 1 year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 year</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, 2007

4.2.5 Position held at the respective churches

The result from Table 5 reveals that 25% of the respondents in the study were the pastors of the churches used or attached clergy and 20.8% of them were those in the planning committees of the churches. These respondents, the researcher used because they are the ones concerned to a great extent to the formulation and ensuring the implementations of the said strategic plans. The elders of the churches accounted for 33.3% of the respondents. The church elders are those used in most cases to give advice to the rest of the church committees.

Table 5: Position At The Church

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position held</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastor</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elder</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Committee</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deacons</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Committee</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, 2007
4.2.6 Strategic Decisions Implemented

Table 6: Strategic Decisions Implemented

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recently Executed Strategic Decisions</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction a new program or service</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening of a new church or facility</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinuation of a ministry</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire or merging with another church</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of strategy in an operational department</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, 2007

Respondents were asked to indicate which of the decisions the respective churches had recently executed. Table 6 indicates that 37% of the respondents interviewed stated that their church had introduced new programs or church services and 21% had opened up new church new facilities. Discontinuation of a ministry and acquiring or merging with another church scored the least with 8% each.

Table 7: Church Strategic Planning Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decisions Implemented</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your church engage in strategic planning?</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We refer to strategic plans when planning to execute activities</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our current church policies adequately support strategic plans</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The strategies being used are derived from the strategic plans</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The church leaders are always at the forefront in the implementation of the church strategies</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our current church leaders and elders have the skills for successful implementation of the church strategies</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The church has conducted staff training in strategy implementation

| The church has conducted staff training in strategy implementation | 11 | 45.8 | 13 | 54.2 |
| Finance needed for strategy implementation is always available | 15 | 62.5 | 9 | 37.5 |

Source: Author, 2007

The respondents were asked to state if they agreed with the statements as given in Table 7 which revealed that the majority of the churches engaged in strategic planning (87.5%) and the leadership was skilled enough to assist in successful implementation of the same with 70.9%. However, thought the leaders and elders were skillful in the implementation of the strategies, they were not always at the forefront in there actual implementation scoring only 41.7%.

### 4.3 Challenges of Strategy Implementation

The objective of this study was to determine strategic implementation challenges that face mainstream churches in Kenya. To achieve this objective respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they encountered certain challenges in their respective churches while implementing strategy. A 5-point scale where 1 = No extent at all; 2 = Little extent; 3 = Moderate extent; 4 = Great extent; 5 = Very great extent, was used.

The information was scored, such that no extent at all give a score of 1; little extent a score of 2; moderate extent a score of 3; great extent a score of 4; very great extent a score of 5. The analysis was done through mean scores where the higher the mean meant the greater the challenge and vice versa. The results are shown in Table 8 where SD reflects the Standard Deviation.

It was revealed from this study, that organizational culture did not support strategy implementation as the greatest challenge scoring the highest mean of 4.500. This challenge was closely followed by problems requiring top management’s attention was not communicated early enough scoring a mean of 4.213 and competing activities distracting attention from intended strategy with a score of 4.073. The least challenge was, key formulators of the strategies did not play an active role in the actual implementations with
a mean score of 2.142 and overall goals were not sufficiently well understood by employees with a mean score of 2.166.

Table 8: Strategy Implementation Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor leadership style</td>
<td>3.166</td>
<td>1.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership and direction provided by managers were not adequate enough</td>
<td>3.166</td>
<td>1.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key formulators of the strategies did not play an active role in the actual implementations</td>
<td>2.142</td>
<td>1.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational culture did not support strategy implementation</td>
<td>4.500</td>
<td>0.8366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor management of the church's resources</td>
<td>3.154</td>
<td>1.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capability of employees involved insufficient</td>
<td>3.909</td>
<td>0.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and instructions given was adequate</td>
<td>2.830</td>
<td>1.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ordination and teamwork was not sufficient</td>
<td>3.122</td>
<td>0.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competing activities distracted attention</td>
<td>4.073</td>
<td>1.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation took more time than allocated</td>
<td>3.616</td>
<td>1.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key tasks and activities were not defined in detail</td>
<td>3.213</td>
<td>1.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall goals were not sufficiently well understood by employees</td>
<td>2.166</td>
<td>1.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems requiring top management were not communicated early enough</td>
<td>4.213</td>
<td>1.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major problems surfaced which had not been identified earlier</td>
<td>3.616</td>
<td>1.213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, 2007

4.4. Coping With Challenges Of Strategy Implementation

The second objective of the study was to establish what mainstream churches in Kenya do to cope with strategy implementation challenges. To determine this objective respondents were asked to give the extent to which the mechanisms indicated in the paper were used to
cope with strategy implementation challenges. A 5-point scale where 1 = No extent at all; 2 = Little extent, 3 = Moderate extent, 4 = Great extent and 5 = Very great extent, was used to give the degree to which they faced the challenge. The information was scored as no extent at all with a score of 1; little extent scored 2; moderate extent scored 3; great extent scored 4; very great extent scored 5. Similarly to the first objective the analysis was done using mean scores where the higher the mean meant the greater the it was as a highly effective mechanism used to cope with the strategy implementation challenge and vice versa. The results are shown in Table 9 where SD reflects the Standard Deviation.

Table 9: Coping With The Challenges To Strategy Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coping Mechanism</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change of overall leadership</td>
<td>1.333</td>
<td>0.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change the top management</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>1.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural adjustment to suit the strategy</td>
<td>2.166</td>
<td>1.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and development staff on objectives</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>1.751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of team work to implementation strategy</td>
<td>4.166</td>
<td>0.982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement of stakeholders through process implementation</td>
<td>3.685</td>
<td>0.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of a process flow chart for implementation</td>
<td>1.666</td>
<td>1.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing environmental issues individually</td>
<td>2.020</td>
<td>1.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of measurement scales for achievements</td>
<td>3.073</td>
<td>1.266</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, 2007

Use of teamwork to implement strategy scored highly as a favored mechanism to cope with strategy implementation among most the churches with a mean score of 4.166. Involvement of stakeholders through process implementation was also highly favored with a mean score of 3.685. The least favored mechanism was change of overall leadership scoring a mean of 1.333 followed closely by, the use of flow charts for implementation with a mean score if 1.666. Involvement of stakeholders through process implementation had mean score of 3.685, a mechanism favored across the churches.
5.1 Summary, Discussions and Conclusions

The first objective of this study was to determine the challenges that face mainstream churches in Kenya. The results indicate that the greatest challenge rested with organizational culture not supporting strategy implementation, communication of problems to top management, which required their attention as well as competing activities distracting attention from the intended strategy. The least challenges were the goals being understood by the employees as well as key formulators playing an active role in the actual implementation and training and instruction given being adequate for the implementation process.

Previous researches (Parsitau, 2006; Obwoge, 2006) done with similar institutions indicated the need for education on strategy implementation to take priority for its success, which from this study shows that mainstream churches have taken into consideration. Challenges such as communication were evident from other researches done and this continues to be a challenge even with the mainstream churches. The cultural impact cannot be stressed enough in most of the researches and the same was true for the mainstream churches.

From the foregoing discussions, the conclusion is that emphasis needs to be put on working on the organizational culture and especially where the institutions are well over 100 years old and change is not necessarily welcome. Activities need to be redefined so that the different departments are not in competition with each other but work together. Speculation of problems that might occur while implementation such as stakeholder matters, resource allocation and spiritual issues should be addressed and openly. Though the study showed that key formulators role in strategy was not a highly rated challenge, perhaps to increased the capability of employees involvement is to ensure that they too are key formulators of the strategy.
The second objective was to establish what mainstream churches in Kenya do to cope with strategy implementation challenges. The results indicate that use of teamwork was a mechanism highly favored and by most of the churches. Involvement of stakeholders was also a popular mechanism as with most of the churches. Change of overall leadership had a low score as a mechanism to cope with strategy implementation as well as use a process flowchart for implementation. Addressing environmental issues did not also score highly as a mechanism to cope with the challenges faced.

Previous studies done on strategy implementation (Parsitau, 2006; Obwoge, 2006) have cited leadership change and measurement scales as the least used mechanisms to ensure that the implementation process takes place. This was the same for the mainstream churches in Kenya which did not favor the mechanisms much either. The leadership however does understand the importance of using teamwork in implementation of any project and the need to involve the stakeholders in the implementation process as with other organizations.

In conclusion from the foregoing discussions churches should not shy away from use of process flow charts for implementation even if most upon probing felt that putting divine matters on a time line is not spiritually moral since God’s timing is not our timing. Some reminded me that it took even up to 50 years for the church to be in its present state thus no sense in measuring tasks. Stakeholder involvement has received favor form the congregants who feel that they now know where their church stands and is goes even in the face of mushrooming of new churches which had earlier lured a large number from the mainstream churches.

5.2 Limitations of the Research

The period of study for this research did not adequately allow for sufficient data collection for a comprehensive study. Of those approached to respond, 14.28% did not do so while others responded way too late to include their feedback in the results. Others did not understand fully the questions or statements in the questionnaire therefore giving a
response according to their own interpretation of the question. The use of the leadership as respondents for the study limited the responses and skewed the results as if to show that leadership was never an issue. It emerged that most of the leaders were the key formulators of the strategies and held significant positions in terms of the implementation process.

5.3 Recommendations for Further Research

The use of an interview guide together with the questionnaire would be a useful tool for data collection. In a matter of fact most of the respondents gave more information about their experience with the strategy implementation process, which was not covered entirely in the questionnaire. Since the respondents showed interest in the study to reveal how they were doing in strategy implementation process, study involving a wider range of respondents such as the congregants, employees, volunteers and overseers would give a much a comprehensive survey.

This study by its nature has not been able to exhaustively investigate all the variables that explain all the internal efficiencies concerning strategy implementation challenges in the mainstream churches in Kenya. Recommended for further research is the impact of management style to strategy implementation and goal setting and controls problems in strategy implementation in the local churches in Kenya.

5.4 Implications for Policy and Practice

The study found that organizational culture did not support strategy implementation to a large extent. It is possible that this challenge may have hindered the potential growth of the church in terms of numbers and expansion in terms of planting new churches. It is recommended that the full involvement of the stakeholders is taken into consideration. These will mean that the congregation, employees, attached clergy and other interest groups are involved in the strategy planning process from the beginning. As the strategy plans are drawn a representative from the stakeholders should be involved. This will allow
for them to own the process as the actual implementation begins to take place. An expert in the field of strategy implementation can be engaged to assist in involving everybody by use of models, which have proven to succeed in the secular world as well as similar institutions.

Communication channels from the lower carder to the senior staff came out as another challenge the mainstream churches. Matters that required the attention of the top management were not communicated early enough thus causing a delay in acting on issues and possibly wasting resources in the process. This can easily cause discouragement among those who are responsible to see that the strategy is successfully implement. It is recommended that the use of teams to manage the strategy process can expedite the communication of any matters requiring top management’s attention. The team should consist of a spectrum of stakeholders as well as senior management. This will ensure that issues faced in each team will be communicated faster and acted upon in good time.

From the study the way in which strategies implementation was communicated in a number of the churches did not give the implementers the clear picture of the strategies and the implementation process. It is recommended that there is need for managers to continually update each other in the project team towards sustaining the implementation momentum. The church leaders need also to insist on a common implementation format so as to streamline communication by pinpointing emerging issues in the period of the implementation. This makes the total impact of communication within the team or unit easier and also greatly enhances comparison or collaboration within the project teams, and with senior management.

Most institutions that have exited for a period of ten or more years have a system that is deeply ingrained that it is almost automatic. Strategy implementation can sometimes mean that we no longer can do as the system has been. For instance the church may need to change the order of service or increase the services to cater for everybody. If it has been that every Sunday at a certain hour another activity has been taking place, it may compete with the intended strategy and eventually fail to take full implementation. Competing
activities distracting attention from the strategy was high on the list of challenges. The use of flowcharts is recommended so that it is possibly for everybody to visualize how the process of change will take place. Drastic measures should be avoided as much as possible but incrementally new activities can be included in the system until it is no longer a distraction but part of the system.

The study also found that major problems surfaced which had no been identified earlier as another challenge. When the implementation process is faced with problems not earlier identified, it is possible to distract the attention of those involved in the implementation process to fire fighting or damage control and abandoning the strategy all together. It is recommended that the use of scenario planning should be done so as to be ready for any eventuality that may occur and yet not get distracted from the implementation process.

The church believes that strategy implementation is a journey of faith, but let us be found ready for anything (Cathedral Church of All Saints, 2007).

These recommendations however do not only apply to those in the mainstream churches only but also to all other organizations in Kenya and other developing countries that would want to improve on their effectiveness in the implementation of strategies to generate competitive advantage over their competitors and enhance corporate growth and sustainability.
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The bearer of this letter, Dorcas Nangui Kung’u, is a Master of Business Administration (MBA) student of the University of Nairobi.

He/she is required to submit as part of his/her coursework assessment a research project report on a management problem. We would like the students to do their projects on real problems affecting firms in Kenya. We would, therefore, appreciate if you assist him/her by allowing him/her to collect data in your organization for the research.

The results of the report will be used solely for academic purposes and a copy of the same will be availed to the interviewed organizations on request.

Thank you.

J.T. KARIUKI
CO-ORDINATOR, MBA PROGRAM
APPENDIX II: LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

September, 2007

Dear Respondent,

I am currently pursuing a course of study for a Degree of Master of Business Administration (MBA) at the School of Business, University of Nairobi. As part of the study I am carrying out a research on: Strategy Implementation Challenges In The Main Stream Churches In Kenya.

Your church has been selected as one of the respondents to participate in this study. This questionnaire is intended to obtain opinions, views, feelings or beliefs to enable me come up with recommendations to assist organizations improve on their practices.

I would wish to request you to spare a few minutes of your precious time to fill in the attached questionnaire and to provide the required information on the above area of study to the best of your knowledge.

The information you will provide will be treated with the utmost confidence and only for the academic purpose mentioned above.

Your assistance in facilitating the same will be highly appreciated.

Thank you,

Yours sincerely,

Dorcas Kung’u
RESEARCHER.

Dr. Martin Ogutu
SUPERVISOR
APPENDIX III: QUESTIONNAIRE

A. Background Information

Please tick in the appropriate position and where applicable answer in the space provided.

1. Gender of the respondent  Male [ ]  Female [ ]

2. Age of the respondent:  18-29 [ ]  40-45 [ ]
                          30-35 [ ]  46-50 [ ]
                          36-39 [ ]  50-55 [ ]
                          55-60+ [ ]

3. Highest level of education attained:  A' Level [ ]  Masters [ ]
                                        Diploma [ ]  PhD [ ]
                                        Degree [ ]  Others

4. How long have you been working for this company:
   Below 1 year [ ]  1-3 years [ ]  4-6 years [ ]  7-9 years [ ] 10+ [ ]

5. Marital status:  Single [ ]  Married [ ]  Divorced [ ]  Widowed [ ]

6. Name of the church ____________________________________________

7. Position in the Church __________________________________________

8. For how long have you been in this position (Years)______________

9. The department of the respondent ________________________________
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10. Which one of the following decisions has been recently executed by your church in the last 5 years? Tick appropriate answer.

( ) Introduction a new program or service
( ) Opening of a new church or facility
( ) Discontinuation of a ministry
( ) Acquire or merging with another church
( ) Change of strategy in an operational department
( ) Other (Please specify)

11. In the following indicate if you agree with the statements by ticking the appropriate answer, YES or NO against each question.

To the best of my knowledge our church has strategic plans
We refer to strategic plans when planning to execute activities
Our current church policies adequately support strategic plans
The strategies being used are derived from the strategic plans
The church leaders are always at the forefront in the implementation of the church strategies.
Our current church leaders and elders have the skills for successful implementation of the church strategies
The church has conducted staff training in strategy implementation
Finance needed for strategy implementation is always available
### B. Strategy Implementation Challenges

To what extent do you find each of the following a challenge in your strategy implementation process. Use a 5-point scale where:

1 = No extent at all
2 = Little extent
3 = Moderate extent
4 = Great extent
5 = Very great extent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Poor leadership style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Leadership and direction provided by departmental managers was inadequate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Key formulators of the strategic decision did not play an active role in the actual implementation of the activities of the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Organizational culture did not support strategy implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Poor management of the church’s resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Capabilities of employees involved was insufficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Training and instructions given to employees was inadequate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Co-ordination and teamwork was not sufficiently effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Competing activities distracted attention from the decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The project took more time than originally allocated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Key implementation tasks and activities were not sufficiently defined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Overall goals were not sufficiently well understood by employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Problems requiring top management involvement were not communicated early enough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Advocates and supporters of the strategic decision left the organization during the project implementation period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Major problems surfaced which had not been identified earlier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Stakeholders influence on the strategy’s implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Targets set were too high.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. Uncontrollable factors outside the church’s ability had an adverse impact on implementation

19. Information systems used to monitor implementation were inadequate

C. Mechanisms Used To Cope With Strategy Implementation Challenges

To what extent did you use each of the following approaches to cope with strategy implementation challenges in your organization. Use a 5-point scale where:

1 = No extent at all
2 = Little extent
3 = Moderate extent
4 = Great extent
5 = Very great extent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Change of the overall leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Change of the top leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Structural adjustment to suit the strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Training and development of strategy objectives to staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Communication of objectives to stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Use of teamwork to implement strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Involvement of stakeholders through the implementation process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Use of a process map/flow chart for implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Addressing of environmental issues individually</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Use of measurement scales for achievement of objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THANK YOU FOR YOUR CO-OPERATION