

**CHALLENGES OF STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION AT THE NAIROBI
COUNTY GOVERNMENT**

OBIGA STEPHEN DON

**A RESEARCH PROJECT SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF
BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, SCHOOL OF BUSINESS UNIVERSITY OF
NAIROBI**

OCTOBER, 2014

DECLARATION

I, the undersigned, declare that this project is my original work and that it has not been presented in any other university or institution for academic credit.

Signature

Date

OBIGA STEPHEN DON

D61/75911/2012

The research project has been submitted for examination with our approval as university supervisor.

Supervisor

Date

DR. BITANGE NDEMO, PhD.,

Senior Lecturer

School of Business

University of Nairobi

DEDICATION

I dedicate this to my lovely Wife Ruth Siboe who has been supportive all the time and especially through my MBA journey. I also dedicate it to my parents and to my children Jesse Baraka, Ava Imani and Geordie Jabari.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I most thank the almighty God bringing me this far and helping me through the entire process. I salute my supervisor Dr. Bitange Ndemo for the encouragement and guidance through the project. I believe his support has come a long way to make this study a success.

I am most grateful to my family members especially my wife, my parents, my brother and sister who kept encouraging me despite the challenges I faced. A special thanks to my colleagues and my line manager at work for their support and encouragement through this process.

Finally I thank my classmates and all my friends who encouraged me through the journey. I truly appreciate your contribution and support.

ABSTRACT

Strategy implementation involves allocation of sufficient resources financial, personnel, time, and establishing a chain of command or organizational structure. It involves assigning responsibility of specific tasks or processes to specific individuals or groups. It also involves managing the process. Many organizations are able to generate innovative strategic plans, but few are able to successfully implement these plans. Some researchers note that organizations fail to implement up to 70% of their strategic initiatives. This study mainly focused on a different context and concept from what the current study seeks to cover. Given the importance of strategy implementation, this study sought to fill the gap by seeking answers to the following research question: the challenges facing strategy implementation at the Nairobi County Government? That is the knowledge gap that the study sought to fill. The objective of the study was to establish the challenges of strategy implementation at the Nairobi County Government. The research adopted a descriptive cross-sectional research design, which is used when the problem has been defined specifically and where the research has certain issue to be described by the respondents about the problem. The study employed a face to face interview as a primary data collection method. An interview guide was employed as the sole research instrument. Content analysis enables researchers to sift through large volumes of data with relative ease in a systematic fashion. Qualitative content analysis does not produce counts and statistical significance. It uncovers patterns, themes, and categories important to a social reality. The study found that level of management skills influences the strategy implementation to great extent. It established that innovativeness is a key success factor in strategy implementation. The study also found organizational structure influences strategy implementation in the organisation. This was through bureaucratic bottlenecks, differentiated roles that lead to specialization, number of reporting lines, harmony of reporting lines and employee placement. It also revealed that the challenges faced during strategy implementation were lack of support from the top management, slow budget approval, lack of clear individual role, lack of alignment with the organization strategic plan, lack of employee involvement, poor staffing level, ineffective communication during strategy implementation and lack of coordination of activities during strategy implementation. It found that employee did not understand what the County Government strives to achieve, politics affected strategy implementation in Nairobi county Government and transition affect strategy implementation. The finding of this study will be of great importance to policy makers as it will help them to come up with factors that delays strategy implementation and those which will hinder their implementation altogether. When such factors are identified, strategies will then be formulated to curb the situation. Strategies that face implementation problems are in most cases those that will give a company the required competitive edge. This implies that there is direct relationship between strategy implementation and the competitiveness of an organisation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION.....	ii
DEDICATION.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
ABSTRACT.....	v
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background of the Study.....	1
1.1.1 Concept of Strategy Implementation	2
1.1.2 Challenges of Strategy Implementation	5
1.1.3 County Governments in Kenya	6
1.1.4 Nairobi County Government	7
1.2 Research Problem.....	8
1.3 Research Objectives	9
1.4 Value of the Study.....	9
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	10
2.1 Introduction	10
2.2 Theoretical Foundation	10
2.2.1 McKinsey 7s Model.....	10
2.2.2 Dynamic Capability Model	11
2.2.3 Resource-Based View Theory	13
2.3 The Strategic Management Process	13
2.4 Strategy Implementation Process	15
2.5 Factors Affecting Strategy Implementation	18
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	27
3.1 Introduction	27
3.2 Research Design.....	27
3.3 Data Collection.....	28
3.4 Data Analysis	28
CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	30
4.1 Introduction	30
4.2 Challenges Of Strategy Implementation	30

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS ...	34
5.1 Introduction	34
5.2 Summary	34
5.3 Conclusion.....	37
5.4 Recommendations	37
5.5 Suggestion For Further Research	38
5.6 Limitation of the Study	39
5.7 Implications of the Study on Policy, Theory and Practice	39
REFERENCES.....	40
APPENDIX.....	44
Interview Guide.....	44

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Strategy implementation has attracted much less attention in strategic and organizational research than strategy formulation or strategic planning. Alexander (2011) suggests several reasons for this: strategy implementation is less glamorous than strategy formulation, people overlook it because of a belief that anyone can do it, people are not exactly sure what it includes and where it begins and ends. Furthermore, there are only a limited number of conceptual models of strategy implementation. Organizations seem to have difficulties in implementing their strategies, however. Researchers have revealed a number of problems in strategy implementation: e.g. weak management roles in implementation, a lack of communication, lacking a commitment to the strategy, unawareness or misunderstanding of the strategy, unaligned organizational systems and resources, poor coordination and sharing of responsibilities, inadequate capabilities, competing activities, and uncontrollable environmental factors (Beer and Eisenstat, 2010).

According to Resource Based Theory resources are inputs into a firm's production process and can be classified into three categories as; physical capital, human capital and organizational capital (Currie, 2009). These resources are need for effectiveness in strategy implementation. Strategic balancing is based on the principle that the strategy of a company is partly equivalent to the strategy of an individual. Indeed, the performance of companies is influenced by the actors' behaviour, including the system of leaders' values (Casley and Krishna 2007).

Devolution in itself has led to a change dilemma as Kenyans ask whether the new structure again fails as it did 38 years ago. Counties will be embraced as the new centers of power and resources. County government in their planning incorporate their contributions in meeting the Millenium Development Goals which includes change management entails thoughtful planning and sensitive implementation, above all consultation with and involvement of the people affected by the changes, (Kotter 2008). The devolved government is expected to promote social and economic development and the provision of proximate, easily accessible services throughout Kenya. While there are a lot of prospects in the success of devolution, there is equal measure of threats to this success. This study seeks to establish the challenges of strategy implementation at the Nairobi County Government.

1.1.1 Concept of Strategy Implementation

Strategy implementation involves allocation of sufficient resources financial, personnel, time, and establishing a chain of command or organizational structure. It involves assigning responsibility of specific tasks or processes to specific individuals or groups. It also involves managing the process. This includes monitoring results, comparing to benchmarks and best practices, evaluating the efficacy and efficiency of the process, controlling for variances, and making adjustments to the process as necessary. Strategy formation and implementation is an on-going, never-ending, integrated process requiring continuous reassessment and reformation (Olson et al. 2005). Strategic management is dynamic. It involves a complex pattern of actions and reactions. It is partially planned and partially unplanned. Strategy is planned and emergent, dynamic, and interactive. Strategic management operates on several time scales. Short term strategies involve planning and managing for the present. Long term strategies involve preparing for and preempting the future (Balogun & Johnson, 2004).

In most corporations there are several levels of strategy. Strategic management is the highest in the sense that it is the broadest, applying to all parts of the firm. It gives direction to corporate values, corporate culture, corporate goals, and corporate missions. Under this broad corporate strategy there are often functional or business unit strategies. Functional strategies include marketing strategies, new product development strategies, human resource strategies, financial strategies, legal strategies, and information technology management strategies (Chebat, 1999). The emphasis is on short and medium term plans and is limited to the domain of each department's functional responsibility. Each functional department attempts to do its part in meeting overall corporate objectives, and hence to some extent their strategies are derived from broader corporate strategies (Bourgeois & Brodwin, 1984).

Many companies feel that a functional organizational structure is not an efficient way to organize activities so they have reengineered themselves according to processes or strategic business units (SBU). An SBU is a semi-autonomous unit within an organization. It is usually responsible for its own budgeting, new product decisions, hiring decisions, and price setting. An SBU is treated as an internal profit centre by corporate headquarters. Each SBU is responsible for developing its business strategies, strategies that must be in tune with broader corporate strategies. The "lowest" level of strategy is operational strategy. It is very narrow in focus and deals with day-to-day operational activities such as scheduling criteria. It must operate within a budget but is not at liberty to adjust or create that budget. Operational level strategy was encouraged by Drucker (1954) in his theory of Management by Objectives (MBO). Operational level strategies are informed by business level strategies which, in turn, are informed by corporate level strategies.

Since the turn of the millennium, there has been a tendency in some firms to revert to a simpler strategic structure. This is being driven by information technology. It is felt that knowledge management systems should be used to share information and create common goals. Strategic divisions are thought to hamper this process. According to Chandler (1962), the organization structure is determined by the strategy. A long term coordinated strategy was necessary to give a company structure, direction, and focus. He states that "structure follows strategy". However it has also been noted more recently that strategy also follows structure.

Simons and Thompson (1998) pointed out that almost all the management functions - planning, controlling, organizing, motivating, leading, directing, integrating, communicating, and innovation is in some degree applied in the implementation process. Hendry and Kiel (2004) also point out that to effectively direct and control the use of the firm's resources, mechanisms such as organizational structure, information systems, leadership styles, assignment of key managers, budgeting, rewards, and control systems are essential strategy implementation ingredients. There should be specific interim or ultimate time-based measurements to be achieved by implementing strategies in pursuit of the company's objectives. The implementation activities are in fact related closely to one another and decisions about each are usually made simultaneously.

The fatal problem with strategy implementation is the de facto success rate of intended strategies. In research studies it is as low as 10 percent (Judson, 1991). Despite this abysmal record, strategy implementation does not seem to be a popular topic at all. In fact, some managers mistake implementation as a strategic afterthought and a pure top-down-approach. Instead, management spends most of its attention on strategy formulation. It is thus not surprising that after a comprehensive strategy formulation,

significant difficulties start arise during the subsequent implementation process. Implementation manifests the strategic intent of an organisation through various tactical and competitive actions to achieve the desired results, which otherwise may remain as distant dreams. Research emphasizing strategy implementation is classified by Bourgeois and Brodwin (2004) as part of a first wave of studies proposing structural views as important facilitators for strategy implementation success.

1.1.2 Challenges of Strategy Implementation

According to Alexander (1985), the ten most frequently occurring strategy implementation problems include underestimating the time needed for implementation and major problems surfacing that had not been anticipated, in addition uncontrollable factors in the external environment had an adverse impact. Based on empirical work with 93 firms, he observed that senior executives were over optimistic in the planning phase and it is noteworthy that the first two issues which occurred most frequently in Alexander's study are planning issues. He also found the effectiveness of coordination of activities and distractions from competing activities inhibited implementation, in addition key tasks were not defined in enough detail. With regard to people, the capabilities of employees involved were often not sufficient, leadership and direction and “training and instruction given to lower level employees were not adequate” (Alexander, 1985, p. 92). Although the least frequent in this study in many cases the information systems used to monitor implementation were not adequate.

Reed and Buckley (1988) discuss problems associated with strategy implementation identifying four key areas for discussion. They acknowledge the challenge and the need for a clear fit between strategy and structure and claim the debate about which comes first is irrelevant providing there is congruence in the context of the operating environment.

They warn that, although budgeting systems are a powerful tool for communication, they have limited use in the implementation of strategies as they are dominated by monetary based measures and due to their size and the game playing associated budget setting “it is possible for the planning intent of any resource redistribution to be ignored” (Reed and Buckley, 1988, p. 68). Another problem is when management style is not appropriate for the strategy being implemented, they cite the example of the “entrepreneurial risk taker may be an ideal candidate for a strategy involving growth, but may be wholly inappropriate for retrenchment” (Reed and Buckley, 1988, p. 68).

1.1.3 County Governments in Kenya

The promulgation of the new constitution in Kenya in 2010 brought about a new system of government. The new system of government had two levels of government, the central government headed by the President; and devolved governments referred to as county governments which were to be headed by governors. The new system of government was to kick off after the 2013 general elections, which was to serve as a platform to elect the national leaders and the county leaders.

A total of 47 counties were created in the constitution. Each county was to receive funding from the National government and at the same time generate funds to sustain themselves. Just like in the case of the president, the county governors were elected on the platform of the vision that they created for their county. The vision was their plans on how to generate funds for their county and how they would make their county the best in the country by improving the standards of living and eradicating the issues affecting the county.

1.1.4 Nairobi County Government

Nairobi County is the most important county so far. This is because it hosts the capital city of the country, it hosts almost all the headquarters of the central government and the biggest industrial town in the country and hence heart of economy of the country. The governor of Nairobi was always going to have a difficult task to control the county that is viewed as the heart beat of the country.

As the governor with the biggest work on his plate, the Nairobi governor was to come up with strategies of tapping the massive potential and delivering the dreams of the residents and the country at large. As the capital of the country, Nairobi County is cosmopolitan and harbors people from all walks of life. The residents have different needs, different dreams, different political following; and it is upon the governor and his government to ensure that all the people have their different needs met.

Nairobi County government was coming from a backdrop of the Nairobi City Council which for many years had been dogged with inefficiencies in provision of services, corruption, bloated operational costs due to ghost workers etc. The Nairobi county government headed by His Excellency the governor Dr. Evans Kidero came into power with the promise of effectively providing services to the people of Nairobi, making the county government profitable by effective revenue collections and reduction of operational costs, as well as increasing efficiency by simplifying processes within the county government. Dr. Kidero and his team had drafted a strategy to deliver all these. In his manifesto “my commitment to you”, Dr. Kidero had laid down strategy of how him and his government was going to deal with Insecurity and job creation, making Nairobi a world-class city, and transforming Nairobi through good governance.

1.2 Research Problem

Many organizations are able to generate innovative strategic plans, but few are able to successfully implement these plans. Some researchers note that organizations fail to implement up to 70% of their strategic initiatives (Miller, 2002). The transition from idea to reality or stated differently, the link between strategy and implementation is complex. The literature suggests that successful strategy implementation is difficult to achieve for six key reasons (Pateman, 2008). These includes persistent pressure from stakeholders for greater profitability, increased complexity of organizations, difficult challenge faced by executives , low levels of participation of a large number of managers across all functions at an early stage of executing strategy, difficulty of securing the required resources to execute the strategy and executives know more about strategy formulation than strategy implementation (Hrebiniak, 2008).

In Kenya a number of studies have been carried out on strategic implementation among them Arumonyang (2009), who did a survey of strategy implementation challenges facing regional development authorities in Kenya, Patrick (2009), on challenges of strategy implementation at Kenya wildlife service, Martha (2010), challenges of strategy implementation at the ministry of road and public works in Kenya. Awino (2009), also did a survey on challenges facing implementation of Differentiation strategy in Mumias Sugar Company. Of the studies done in the area of strategy implementation, none seems to have explored the process of strategy implementation in the new system of devolved government. This study mainly focused on a different context and concept from what the current study seeks to cover. Given the importance of strategy implementation, this study sought to fill the gap by seeking answers to the following research question: the challenges facing strategy implementation at the Nairobi County Government? That is the knowledge gap that the study sought to fill.

1.3 Research Objectives

The objective of the study was to establish the challenges of Strategy Implementation at the Nairobi County Government.

1.4 Value of the Study

The study was important not only to Nairobi County Government but also other counties in Kenya. It was going to help them understand the challenges facing strategy implementation in devolved government. This was to going help county government in service delivery to Kenya as they implement various strategies.

Little is currently known about devolution in Kenya. Counties in Kenya are the new centers of power and resources. Therefore, knowledge on devolved governance is important to policymakers, county employees, politicians, citizens, the central government, the development partners, academicians and researchers.

The study was going to form a reference material for future researchers on other related topics; it will also assist other academicians who will undertake a similar topic in their studies. The study was also going to highlight other important relationships that require further research; such may include areas of relationships between intelligence and firm's performance.

The study will be of great importance to theory and practice as it helps in enlightening on the challenges of strategy implementation at the Nairobi County Government. This will add to existing body of knowledge on the challenges of strategy implementation.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter summarizes the information from authors and researchers who have carried out research in the same field of study. The specific areas covered here are strategy implementation and performance, theoretical orientation and the empirical review: the challenges of strategy implementation.

2.2 Theoretical Foundation

This study sought to establish the challenges of strategy implementation at the Nairobi County Government, it was based on the McKinsey 7S Model, dynamic capability model and the resource based view theory.

2.2.1 McKinsey 7s Model

McKinsey 7s model is a tool that analyzes firm's organizational design by looking at 7 key internal elements: strategy, structure, systems, shared values, style, staff and skills, in order to identify if they are effectively aligned and allow organization to achieve its objectives. McKinsey 7s model was developed in 1980s by McKinsey consultants Tom, Robert and Julien with a help from Richard and Anthony. It sought to present an emphasis on human resources (Soft S), rather than the traditional mass production tangibles of capital, infrastructure and equipment, as a key to higher organizational performance, (Modahl, 2000). The goal of the model was to show how 7 elements of the company: Structure, Strategy, Skills, Staff, Style, Systems, and Shared values, can be aligned together to achieve effectiveness in a company. The key point of the model is that all the seven areas are interconnected and a change in one area requires change in the rest of a firm for it to function effectively.

The model can be applied to many situations and is a valuable tool when organizational design is at question. The most common uses of the framework are: to facilitate organizational change, to help implement new strategy, to identify how each area may change in a future and to facilitate the merger of organizations, (Westley, 2008).

In McKinsey model, the seven areas of organization are divided into the 'soft' and 'hard' areas. Strategy, structure and systems are hard elements that are much easier to identify and manage when compared to soft elements. On the other hand, soft areas, although harder to manage, are the foundation of the organization and are more likely to create the sustained competitive advantage, (Maalu, 2008).

2.2.2 Dynamic Capability Model

Several theorists have recognized a problem with this static model of the strategy process: it is not how strategy is developed in real life. Strategy is actually a dynamic and interactive process. Some of the earliest challenges to the planned strategy approach came from Linblom in the 1960s and Quinn in the 1980s. Lindblom (2009) claimed that strategy is a fragmented process of serial and incremental decisions. His study viewed strategy as an informal process of mutual adjustment with little apparent coordination. Quinn (2008) developed an approach called "logical Instrumentalism". It claimed that strategic management involves guiding actions and events towards a conscious strategy in a step-by-step process.

Managers nurture and promote strategies that are themselves changing. In regard to the nature of strategic management he says: "Constantly integrating the simultaneous incremental process of strategy formulation and implementation is the central art of effective strategic management. Whereas Lindblom saw strategy as a disjointed process

without conscious direction, Quinn saw the process as fluid but controllable. Bower (2010) and Burgelman (2000) took this one step further. Not only are strategic decisions made incrementally rather than as part of a grand unified vision, but according to them, this multitude of small decisions are made by numerous people in all sections and levels of the organization.

Mintzberg (2007) made a distinction between deliberate strategy and emergent strategy. Emergent strategy originates not in the mind of the strategist, but in the interaction of the organization with its environment. He claims that emergent strategies tend to exhibit a type of convergence in which ideas and actions from multiple sources integrate into a pattern. A particularly insightful model of strategy process dynamics comes from Moncrieff (2009) who recognized that strategy is partially deliberate and partially unplanned, though whether the resulting performance is better for being planned or not is unclear.

The unplanned element comes from two sources: “emergent strategies” result from the emergence of opportunities and threats in the environment and “Strategies in action” are ad hoc actions by many people from all parts of the organization. These multitudes of small actions are typically not intentional, not teleological, not formal, and not even recognized as strategic. They are emergent from within the organization, in much the same way as “emergent strategies” are emergent from the environment. However, it is again not clear whether, or under what circumstances, strategies would be better if more planned. In this model, strategy is planned and emergent, dynamic, and interactive. Five general processes interact. They are strategic intention, the organization's response to emergent environmental issues, the dynamics of the actions of individuals within the organization, the alignment of action with strategic intent, and strategic learning.

2.2.3 Resource-Based View Theory

The resource-based view (RBV) of Wernerfelt (1984) suggests that competitiveness can be achieved by innovatively delivering superior value to customers. The extant literature focuses on the strategic identification and use of resources by a firm for developing a sustained competitive advantage (Borg & Gall, 2009). International business theorists also explain the success and failures of firms across boundaries by considering the competitiveness of their subsidiaries or local alliances in emerging markets (Ben-Dak, 1999). Local knowledge provided by a subsidiary or local alliance becomes an important resource for conceptualizing value as per the local requirements (Gupta *et al.*, 2011).

According to Resource Based Theory resources are inputs into a firm's production process and can be classified into three categories as; physical capital, human capital and organizational capital (Currie, 2009). A capability is a capacity for a set of resources to perform a stretch task of an activity. Each organization is a collection of unique resources and capabilities that provides the basis for its strategy and the primary source of its returns. Thus, differences in firm's performances across time are driven primarily by their unique resources and capabilities rather than by an industry's structural characteristics (Currie, 2009).

2.3 The Strategic Management Process

It is useful to consider strategy formulation as part of a strategic management process that comprises three phases. These phases are diagnosis, formulation, and implementation. Strategic management is an ongoing process to develop and revise future-oriented strategies that allow an organization to achieve its objectives, considering its capabilities, constraints, and the environment in which it operates (Fuerer and Chaharbaghi, 1997). Diagnosis includes performing a situation analysis (analysis of the internal environment

of the organization), including identification and evaluation of current mission, strategic objectives, strategies, and results, plus major strengths and weaknesses. Analyzing the organization's external environment, including major opportunities and threats and identifying the major critical issues, which are a small set, typically two to five, of major problems, threats, weaknesses, and/or opportunities that require particularly high priority attention by management.

Formulation, the second phase in the strategic management process, produces a clear set of recommendations, with supporting justification, that revise as necessary the mission and objectives of the organization, and supply the strategies for accomplishing them. In formulation, we are trying to modify the current objectives and strategies in ways to make the organization more successful. This includes trying to create "sustainable" competitive advantages although most competitive advantages are eroded steadily by the efforts of competitors.

A good recommendation should be effective in solving the stated problem(s), practical (can be implemented in this situation, with the resources available), feasible within a reasonable time frame, cost-effective, not overly disruptive, and acceptable to key "stakeholders" in the organization. It is important to consider "fits" between resources plus competencies with opportunities, and also fits between risks and expectations.

According to early scholars in this field such as Andrews (1971), strategy is a rational decision-making process by which the organization's resources are matched with opportunities arising from the competitive environment. Others, such as Aldrich (1979), state that the environment has a strong deterministic influence on the strategy-making processes in organizations. On the other hand, proponents of the resource-based view argue that it is not the environment but the resources of the organization which form the

foundation of firm strategy (Grant, 1991). Despite the differences, all these frameworks have one thing in common which is that they all aim at maximizing the performance of an organization by improving its position in relation to other organizations operating in the same competitive environment. This, however, becomes more and more difficult as the level of competition in different competitive environments continues to intensify.

In the early 1960s Ansoff (1965) laid the foundations for strategic planning by demonstrating the need to match business opportunities with organizational resources and illustrating the usefulness of strategic plans. In the 1980s, the focus shifted from strategic planning towards strategic management (Schendel and Hofer, 1979). Led by Porter (1980, 1985), a broad range of concepts and techniques evolved which were aimed at building and sustaining competitive advantage by anticipating and exploiting business opportunities. Several other approaches to strategy formulation have been taken which included value chain concept (Porter, 1985) and the 7S framework (McKinsey and Company, 1986)

Despite the increasing awareness for a more dynamic approach to strategy formulation and implementation, research up-to-date provides little guidance on how such an approach may be realized. Only a small number of concepts have been proposed which sketch out the basic parameters for a dynamic approach (Fuerer and Chaharbaghi, 1997).

2.4 Strategy Implementation Process

Strategic decisions determine the organizational relations to its external environment, encompass the entire organization, depend on input from all of functional areas in the organization, have a direct influence on the administrative and operational activities, and are vitally important to long-term health of an organization (Shirley, 1982). According to

Schermerhorn (1989), strategies must be well formulated and implemented in order to attain organizational objectives. Successful strategy implementation depends a lot on the achievement of good “fits” between the strategies and their means of implementation.

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.

Simons and Thompson (1998) refer to three categories of factors that affected strategic decision-making process: environmental factors; organizational factors; and decision-specific factors. Here, environmental factors mean external agents such as national culture, national economic conditions, and industry conditions. Organizational factors refer to organizational structure, organizational culture, structure of decision making bodies, impact of upward influence, and employee involvement. Decision-specific factors can be explained as time, risk, complexity, and politics. According to Porter (1979) strategists must assess the forces affecting competition in their industry and identify their company's strengths and weaknesses. They then need to take appropriate action that addresses the specific forces.

Wessel (1993) stated that there were mostly individual barriers to strategy implementation such as too many and conflicting priorities, insufficient top team functions, a top down management style, inter-functional conflicts, poor vertical communication, and inadequate management development.

Christensen and Donovan (1998) mentioned that intended strategies would be implemented as they have been envisioned if three conditions were met. First, those in the organization must understand each important detail in management's intended strategy. Second, if the organization is to take collective action, the strategy needs to make as much sense to each of the members in the organization as they view the world from their own context, as it does to top management. Finally, the collective intentions must be realized with little unanticipated influence from outside political, technological, or market forces.

Peng and Litteljohn (2001) noted two dimensions of strategy implementation: structural arrangements, and the selection and development of key roles. According to Govindarajan (1989), effective strategy implementation is affected by the quality of people involved in the process. Peng and Litteljohn (2001) claimed the quality of people as skills, attitudes, capabilities, experiences and other characteristics required by a specific task or position.

McKinsey's (1982) model describes the seven factors critical for effective strategy execution. The 7-S model identifies the seven factors as strategy, structure, systems, staff, skills, style/culture, and shared values. Strategy is the positioning and actions taken by an enterprise, in response to or anticipation of changes in the external environment, intended to achieve competitive advantage. Structure refers to the way in which tasks and people are specialized and divided, and authority is distributed; how activities and reporting relationships are grouped; the mechanisms by which activities in the organization are coordinated (Kaplan, 2005). Systems refer to the formal and informal procedures used to manage the organization, including management control systems, performance measurement and reward systems, planning, budgeting and resource allocation systems,

and management information systems. Staff refers to the people, their backgrounds and competencies; how the organization recruits, selects, trains, socializes, manages the careers, and promotes employees. Skills refer to the distinctive competencies of the organization; what it does best along dimensions such as people, management practices, processes, systems, technology, and customer relationships (Kaplan, 2005). Style/culture refers to the leadership style of managers – how they spend their time, what they focus attention on, what questions they ask of employees, how they make decisions; also the organizational culture (the dominant values and beliefs, the norms, the conscious and unconscious symbolic acts taken by leaders (job titles, dress codes, executive dining rooms, corporate jets, informal meetings with employees). Lastly, shared values refer to the core or fundamental set of values that are widely shared in the organization and serve as guiding principles of what is important; vision, mission, and values statements that provide a broad sense of purpose for all employees (Kaplan, 2005). The 7-S model posits that organizations are successful when they achieve an integrated harmony among three “hard” “S’s” of strategy, structure, and systems, and four “soft” “S’s” of skills, staff, style, and super-ordinate goals (now referred to as shared values) (Kaplan, 2005).

2.5 Factors Affecting Strategy Implementation

The fatal problem with strategy implementation is the de facto success rate of intended strategies. In research studies it is as low as 10% (Judson, 1991). Despite this abysmal record, strategy implementation does not seem to be a popular topic at all. In fact, some managers mistake implementation as a strategic afterthought and a pure top-down approach. Instead, management spends most of its attention on strategy formulation. This can be documented by the focus on strategy formulation in strategic management literature. To resolve this, strategic management should accomplish its very own shift of

emphasis by moving from a 90:10 concern with strategy formulation relative to implementation to a minimum 50:50 proportion with each (Grundy, 1998). To overcome and improve the difficulties in the implementation context, Rapa and Kauffman (2005) compiled the following checklist of ten critical points.

Commitment of Top management- The most important thing when implementing a strategy is the top management's commitment to the strategic direction itself. This is undoubtedly a prerequisite for strategy implementation. Therefore, top managers must demonstrate their willingness to give energy and loyalty to the implementation process. This demonstrable commitment becomes, at the same time, a positive signal for all the affected organizational members (Rapa and Kauffman, 2005).

To successfully improve the overall probability that the strategy is implemented as intended, senior executives must abandon the notion that lower-level managers have the same perceptions of the strategy and its implementation, of its underlying rationale, and its urgency. Instead, they must believe the exact opposite. They must not spare any effort to persuade the employees of their ideas (Rapa and Kauffman, 2005).

Involvement of Middle Manager's Valuable Knowledge- Strategy implementation is not a top-down-approach. Consequently, the success of any implementation effort depends on the level of involvement of middle managers. To generate the required acceptance for the implementation as a whole, the affected middle managers' knowledge (which is often underestimated) must already be accounted for in the formulation of the strategy. Then, by making sure that these managers are a part of the strategy process, their motivation towards the project will increase and they will see themselves as an important part in the process (Rapa and Kauffman, 2005). Research studies indicate that less than 5% of a typical workforce understands their organization's strategy (Kaplan and Norton,

2001). Without understanding the general course of strategy, employees cannot effectively contribute to a strategy implementation. To involve employees is an important milestone to make strategy everyone's everyday job.

The role of communication- At first look, the suggestion that communication aspects should be emphasized in the implementation process seems to be a very simple one. Even though studies point out that communication is a key success factor within strategy implementation (Miniace and Falter, 1996), communicating with employees concerning issues related to the strategy implementation is frequently delayed until the changes have already crystallized.

In this context, it is recommended that an organization institute a two-way-communication program that permits and solicits questions from employees about issues regarding the formulated strategy. In addition to soliciting questions and feedback, the communications should tell employees about the new requirements, tasks and activities to be performed by the affected employees, and, furthermore, cover the reason ("the why") behind changed circumstances (Alexander, 1985).

It is essential both during and after an organizational change to communicate information about organizational developments to all levels in a timely fashion. However, one may not misunderstand communication, or the sharing of information, as engagement the direct dialogue that produces active participants in the change process. The way in which a change is presented to employees is of great influence to their acceptance of it. To deal with this critical situation, an integrated communications plan must be developed. Such a plan is an effective vehicle for focusing the employees' attention on the value of the selected strategy to be implemented (Rapa and Kauffman, 2005).

Clear assignment of responsibilities- One of the reasons why strategy implementation processes frequently result in difficult and complex problems – or even fail at all – is the vagueness of the assignment of responsibilities. In addition, these responsibilities are diffused through numerous organizational units (Rapa and Kauffman, 2005). Cross-functional relations are representative of an implementation effort. This is indeed a challenge, because as already mentioned before organizational members tend to think only in their “own” department structures. This may be worsened by over-bureaucracy and can thus end up in a disaster for the whole implementation (Rapa and Kauffman, 2005). To avoid power struggles between departments and within hierarchies, one should create a plan with clear assignments of responsibilities regarding detailed implementation activities. This is a preventive way of proceeding. Responsibilities are clear and potential problems are therefore avoided (Rapa and Kauffman, 2005).

Role of Teamwork in Strategy implementation- Teamwork plays an important role within the process of strategy implementation. When it comes to implementation activities, it is often ignored. It is indisputable, that teams can play an important part to promote the implementation of a strategy (Rapa and Kauffman, 2005). To build up effective teams within strategy implementation the Myers-Briggs typology can be useful to ascertain person-to-person differences. Differences in personality can result in serious inconsistencies in how strategies are understood and acted upon. Recognizing different personality types and learning how to handle them effectively is a skill that can be acquired. Over one million surveys are performed each year in corporate settings for team building and management development. More than any other field of activity, implementation is the area that benefits most from a trained and personality-sensitive management team (Noble, 1999).

Individual difference- Human resources represent a valuable intangible asset. Latest study research indicates that human resources are progressively becoming the key success factor within strategy implementation. In the past, one of the major reasons why strategy implementation efforts failed was that the human factor was conspicuously absent from strategic planning (Lorange, 1998). This leads to a dual demand (Rapa and Kauffman, 2005).

First, considerations regarding people have to be integrated into considerations about strategy implementation in general. Second, the individual behavior of these persons is to be taken into account. Individual personality differences often determine and influence implementation. The difference of individuals requires, as a consequence, different management styles. For the purpose of strategy implementation it is desirable to create a fit between the intended strategy and the specific personality profile of the implementation's key players in the different organizational departments (Rapa and Kauffman, 2005).

Supportive implementation Instruments- To facilitate the implementation in general, implementation instruments should be applied to support the processes adequately. Two implementation instruments are the balanced scorecard and supportive software solutions (Rapa and Kauffman, 2005). The balanced scorecard is a popular and prevalent management system that considers financial as well as non-financial measures. It provides a functionality to translate a company's strategic objectives into a coherent set of performance measures (Kaplan and Norton, 1993). When it comes to meeting the criteria of a strategy implementation instrument, there is an excellent fit. BSC therefore provides even more than a controlling instrument for the implementation process.

A strategic planning system cannot achieve its full potential until it is integrated with other control systems like budgets, information and reward systems. The balanced scorecard provides a framework to integrate the strategic planning and meets the requirements that the strategic planning system itself can display (Rapa and Kauffman, 2005). In the context of implementing strategies, the application of software solutions seems to be neglected. Recent experience has shown that IT-support is gaining more and more importance. Information tools must be available and adequate to allow strategic decision makers to monitor progress towards strategic goals and objectives, track actual performance, pinpoint accountability, and most important provide an early warning of any need to adjust or reformulate the strategy (Rapa and Kauffman, 2005).

Unfortunately, this seems to be limited to enterprise resource planning (ERP) systems, which are prevalent in the operative environment of a company's day-to-day business. The supportive character in monitoring and tracking the implementation process should be in the center of interest (Rapa and Kauffman, 2005). In the past, these activities were tracked manually or launched on an ad hoc basis so that there was a lack in mandatory installed business processes. Software solution is a starting point to define as mentioned above clear assignments of responsibilities throughout the organization's implementation processes (Rapa and Kauffman, 2005).

According to Alexander (1985), the ten most frequently occurring strategy implementation problems include underestimating the time needed for implementation and major problems surfacing that had not been anticipated, in addition uncontrollable factors in the external environment had an adverse impact. Based on empirical work with 93 firms, he observed that senior executives were over optimistic in the planning phase and it is noteworthy that the first two issues which occurred most frequently in

Alexander's study are planning issues. He also found the effectiveness of coordination of activities and distractions from competing activities inhibited implementation, in addition key tasks were not defined in enough detail. With regard to people, the capabilities of employees involved were often not sufficient, leadership and direction and “training and instruction given to lower level employees were not adequate” (Alexander, 1985, p. 92). Although the least frequent in this study in many cases the information systems used to monitor implementation were not adequate.

Al Ghamdi (1998) replicated the work of Alexander (1985) in the UK and found for 92% of firms implementation took more time than originally expected, that major problems surfaced in 88% of companies, again showing planning weaknesses. He found the effectiveness of coordination of activities as a problem in 75% and distractions from competing activities in 83% cases. In addition key tasks were not defined in enough detail and information systems were inadequate in 71% of respondents. What is interesting is that there is congruence between these findings, which implies that lessons have still not been learned; as Al Ghamdi states, “the drama still continues” (Al Ghamdi, 1998, p. 322).

Notable barriers to successful strategy implementation about which there appears to be a degree of accord including Beer and Eisenstat's (2000, p. 37) who assert that six silent killers of strategy implementation comprise: a top-down/laissez-faire senior management style; unclear strategic intentions and conflicting priorities; an ineffective senior management team; poor vertical communication; weak co-ordination across functions, businesses or borders; and inadequate down-the-line leadership skills development (Beer and Eisenstat, 2000). It is recognised that such change requires a shared vision and consensus (Beer et al., 1990) and “failures of strategy implementation are inevitable” if competence, coordination and commitment are lacking (Eisenstat, 1993).

Corboy and O'Corrbui (1999), meanwhile, identify the deadly sins of strategy implementation which involve: a lack of understanding of how the strategy should be implemented; customers and staff not fully appreciating the strategy; unclear individual responsibilities in the change process; difficulties and obstacles not acknowledged, recognised or acted upon; and ignoring the day-to-day business imperatives. Overall though, it is increasingly acknowledged that the traditionally recognised problems of inappropriate organisational structure and lack of top management backing are not the main inhibiting factors to effective strategy implementation (Aaltonen and Ikåvalko, 2002).

Rather, the major challenges to be overcome appear to be more cultural and behavioural in nature, including the impact of poor communication and diminished feelings of ownership and commitment (Aaltonen and Ikåvalko, 2002). Aaltonen and Ikåvalko recognise the role of middle managers, arguing they are the “key actors” “who have a pivotal role in strategic communication” (Aaltonen and Ikåvalko, 2002) meanwhile Bartlett and Goshal (1996) talk about middle managers as threatened silent resisters whose role needs to change more towards that of a “coach”, building capabilities, providing support and guidance through the encouragement of entrepreneurial attributes. In addition to the above, another inhibitor to successful strategy implementation that has been receiving a considerable amount of attention is the impact of an organization's existing management controls (Langfield-Smith, 1997) and particularly its budgeting systems (Marginson, 2002).

Although it is increasingly suggested that budgets suffer from being bureaucratic and protracted, and that they focus on cost minimization rather than value maximization (Brander Brown and Atkinson, 2001), they still represent the main integrative control mechanism in many, if not most, business organizations (Otley, 2001). So far in this review of literature on strategy implementation there is evidence of some recurring themes, including communication and coordination which are essential to ensure that people across the organisation know what to do and to ensure that they stay focused on the key targets under the everyday pressures.

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter sets out various stages and phases that was followed in the collection, measurement and analysis of data. Specifically the following subsections included; research design, target population, data collection instruments, data collection procedures and the data analysis.

3.2 Research Design

Creswell (2003) defines a research design as the scheme, outline or plan that is used to generate answers to research problems. Dooley (2007) notes that a research design is the structure of the research, that holds all the elements in a research project together. The research adopted a descriptive cross-sectional research design, which is used when the problem has been defined specifically and where the research has certain issue to be described by the respondents about the problem to (Kothari 2004).

The design shows which individuals are to be studied, when and where and under which circumstances they are being studied. More equally, research design refers to the way the study is designed, that is, the method used to carry out a research. It is important to highlight the method that was used when investigating and collecting data that is qualitative approach. A qualitative approach to research generally was concerned with inductive testing (Saunders, 2003).

3.3 Data Collection

The study employed a face to face interview as a primary data collection method. Primary data is data that has not been previously published, that is, data derived from a new or original research study and collected at the source. It is information that was obtained directly from first-hand sources for example by means of surveys, observation or experimentation.

An interview guide was employed as the sole research instrument. The researcher used the interview guide to gather information from the selected top management staff of Nairobi County government. The interview guide had open-ended questions. The open-ended questions provide additional information that may not have been captured in the close-ended questions.

The researcher used the interview guide to aid in obtaining information from the respective respondents who are the top management staff that are well conversant with the county operation. The researcher exercised care and control to ensure all interview guides was used to collect data from the respondents are filled and to achieve this, the researcher maintained a register of interview guides, which was used. The primary focus in this research was top management. The respondents included ten top management staff at Nairobi County government.

3.4 Data Analysis

The data was analysed using content analysis. Content analysis enables researchers to sift through large volumes of data with relative ease in a systematic fashion. It can be a useful technique to discover and describe the focus of individual, group, institutional, or social attention. It also allowed inferences to be made which can then be corroborated using other methods of data collection (Weber, 1990).

Qualitative content analysis does not produce counts and statistical significance. It uncovers patterns, themes, and categories important to a social reality. Presenting research findings from qualitative content analysis is challenging. Although it is a common practice to use typical quotations to justify conclusions (Schilling, 2006), the study incorporated other options for data display, including graphs and charts (Miles and Huberman, 1994). Qualitative research is fundamentally interpretive, and interpretation represents your personal and theoretical understanding of the phenomenon under study.

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the data analysis and interpretation of the study. The primary data was collected using an interview guide and analysis was done through content analysis to establish the challenges of strategy implementation at the Nairobi County Government.

4.2 Challenges Of Strategy Implementation

The study requested the interviewee to indicate the challenge faced in the formulation and implementation of strategy, the interviewee indicated that the challenges faced during the formulation and implementation of strategy were lack of support from the top management, slow budget approval, lack of clear individual role, lack of alignment with the organization strategic plan, lack of employee involvement, poor staffing level, ineffective communication during strategy implementation and lack of coordination of activities during strategy implementation.

The interviewees were requested to indicate whether all employees understand what the Nairobi County Government strives to achieve. From the finding the study revealed that employee did not understand what the Nairobi County Government strives to achieve as there was no proper communication in the organization. Employees were not involved in designing of the strategic plan and there was lack of clear individual role in the County.

The study sought to determine whether politics affected strategy implementation in Nairobi county Government, and therefore requested the interviewee to indicate whether politics affected strategy implementation in Nairobi county Government. The study revealed that politics affected strategy implementation in Nairobi county Government, through various MCA who derailed the strategy implementation in the county and

through constant wrangling among the MCAs from the different divide of the opposing political coalitions. Nairobi being the Capital city, National politics had a big effect on strategy implementation in the county. There was politics in the allocation of funds to strategy implementation, politics affected individual's role in the strategy implementation and that politics was affecting coordination of activities during strategy implementation.

From the finding on whether organisations structure affects strategy implementation at Nairobi county government, the interviewees indicated that organisations structure affected strategy implementation at Nairobi county government. This was through communication challenges, individual role, and co-ordination of activities. The organization embraces freedom of expression during strategy implementation. The organization size affects strategy implementation; organization chart affects strategy implementation as well. Supervisors delegate duties and functions during strategy implementation and management organizes meetings to discuss issues on strategy implementation. The organizational structure is different in each business; this is key in strategy implementation. The structure also affects strategy implementation through bureaucratic bottlenecks, differentiated roles that lead to specialization, number of reporting lines, type of the structure, harmony of reporting lines and employee placement. These finding concur with the finding of Olson et al. (2005) mentioning that organizational structure (such as formalization, centralization, specialization, and integration) is a critical component of strategy implementation (Tan, 2001). Consequently, a suitable structure of an organization may have influence on organizational innovation. Then it brings about to superior organizational performance.

The study sought to establish whether the transition from Nairobi City Council to Nairobi County government affected strategy implementation. From the finding the interviewees indicated that transition affected strategy implementation as the County government was able to fund its own funds with consulting the national government. The county government strategy was in line with requirement of the County development and need rather than in line with national government strategy as in the earlier case. With transition MCA politics affected strategy implementation and they were not held accountable as it was the case earlier.

The interviewees were requested to indicate whether the staff in the county government are well skilled and equipped to implement strategy in the organisation. From the finding the study revealed that staffs in the county government were well skilled and equipped to implement strategy in the organisation. The study found that employee were well trained in order to improve their ability to perform, they were sharing organizational goal, they acted as role model, there were training and development programmes designed to educate employees beyond the requirements of their current position so that they are prepared for a broader and more challenging roles in the organization. Employees participated in making job-related decisions and employees were very creative.

These finding concur with the finding of Lorange,(1998) argued that human resources represent a valuable intangible assets. He further asserts that one of the major reasons why strategy implementation efforts failed was that the human factor was conspicuously absent from strategic planning. Rapa and Kauffman, (2005) argues that for purpose of strategy implementation, it is desirable to create a fit between the intended strategy and the specific personality profile of the implementation's key players in the different organizational departments.

The study requested the interviewee to indicate whether government policy and legislation affected strategy implementation in Nairobi County. From the finding the study found that government policy and legislation affected strategy implementation in Nairobi County through aligning county strategy with national government strategy , aligning county strategy with vision 2030 and aligning the county strategy with various government regulation.

The study requested the interviewee whether organisations have sufficient systems and technology for their strategy implement. Finding from the study revealed that Nairobi County did have enough sufficient systems and technology for their strategy implement. The study found that they had not invested in the latest technology and they were unskilled on the new technologies.

On whether there forces opposed to Nairobi government's strategic intent, the interviewee indicated that there were force opposed to Nairobi government's strategic intent. These forces were political interference, legislation, lack of top management support and employee resistance to change.

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

From the analysis and data collected, the following discussions, conclusion and recommendations were made. The responses were based on the objective of the study. The researcher had intended to establish the challenges of strategy implementation at the Nairobi County Government

5.2 Summary

The study revealed that challenges faced during the formulation and implementation of strategy were lack of support from the top management , slow budget approval , lack of clear individual role, lack of alignment with the organization strategic plan , lack of employee involvement , poor staffing level , ineffective communication during strategy implementation and lack of coordination of activities during strategy implementation .

The study found that employees did not understand what the Nairobi County Government strives to achieve as they were no proper communication in the organization, employee were not involved in designing of the strategic plan and there was lack of clear individual role in the County.

The study established that politics affected strategy implementation in Nairobi county Government, through various MCA who derailed the strategy implementation , through national political as Nairobi was the Capital city , there was politics in the allocation of funds to strategy implementation , politic affected individual role in the strategy implementation and that political was affecting coordination of activities during strategy implementation.

The study established that organisations structure affect strategy implementation at Nairobi county government, this was through communication, individual role, co-ordination of activities, organization embraces freedom of expression during strategy implementation, organization size affects strategy implementation, organization chart affects strategy implementation, supervisors delegate duties and functions during strategy implementation and management organizes meetings to discuss issues on strategy implementation and organizational structure is different in each business and is key to strategy implementation, through bureaucratic bottlenecks, differentiated roles that lead to specialization, number of reporting lines, implementation challenges, type of the structure, harmony of reporting lines and employee placement.

These finding concur with the finding of Olson et al. (2005) mention that organizational structure (such as formalization, centralization, specialization, and integration) is a critical component of strategy implementation (Tan, 2001). Consequently, a suitable structure of an organization may have influence on organizational innovation. Then it brings about to superior organizational performance.

The study revealed that transition affect strategy implementation as the County government was able to fund its own funds with consulting the national government, county government strategy was in line with requirement of the County development and need rather than in line with national government strategy, with transition MCA politics affected strategy implementation and they were not held accountable as it was the case earlier.

The study found that staff in the county government were well skilled and equipped to implement strategy in the organisation, as the study found that employee were well trained in order to improve their ability to perform, employee were sharing

organizational goal , employee acted as role model, there were training and development programmes designed to educate employees beyond the requirements of their current position so that they are prepared for a broader and more challenging role in the organization , employee participated in making job-related decisions and employee were very creative.

These finding concur with the finding of Lorange,(1998) argued that human resources represent a valuable intangible assets, he further asserts that one of the major reasons why strategy implementation efforts failed was that the human factor was conspicuously absent from strategic planning. Rapa and Kauffman, (2005) argues that for purpose of strategy implementation, it is desirable to create a fit between the intended strategy and the specific personality profile of the implementation's key players in the different organizational departments.

The study found that government policy and legislation affected strategy implementation in Nairobi County, through aligning county strategy with national government strategy , aligning county strategy with vision 2030 and aligning the county strategy with various government regulation. The study revealed that Nairobi County did have enough sufficient systems and technology for their strategy implement, as the study found that they had not invested in the latest technology and they were unskilled on the new technologies. On whether there forces opposed to opposed to Nairobi government's strategic intent, the s interviewee indicated that there were force opposed to Nairobi government's strategic intent, which were political interference , legislation, lack of top management support and employee resistance to change .

5.3 Conclusion

From the findings the study concluded that level of management skills influences the strategy implementation to great extent. The study established that innovativeness is a key success factor in strategy implementation. It affects strategy implementation to a great extent.

The study concluded that the organizational structure influences strategy implementation in the county government. This was through bureaucratic bottlenecks, differentiated roles that lead to specialization, number of reporting lines, implementation challenge, type of the structure with the flat allowing implementation, harmony of reporting lines and employee placement.

The study revealed that the challenges faced during strategy implementation were lack of support from the top management , slow budget approval , lack of clear individual role, lack of alignment with the organization strategic plan , lack of employee involvement , poor staffing level , ineffective communication during strategy implementation and lack of coordination of activities during strategy implementation .

The study found that employee did not understand what the Nairobi County Government strives to achieve, politics affected strategy implementation in Nairobi county Government and transition affect strategy implementation.

5.4 Recommendations

From the discussions and the conclusions, the researcher concluded that for an efficient and effective implementation process the senior management should be involved and committed throughout the process. Departmental employees should be provided with a sound understanding of the forthcoming changes and of the new way of understanding,

preparation must be done as much as possible before embarking on full implementation; and also the organization must ensure that there are sufficient resources for the transition. Employees should be told what the county government expects from them and their role in implementation of the county's strategic plans. Top managers and the board of directors should be empowered to make the necessary decisions.

The study recommends that there is need to enhance the level of employee skills in the organization as this will help in strategy implementation thus enhancing the performance. Employee skills promote shared vision, integrity and promote innovations. The county government should be quick to embrace technology and invest in systems that will promote easier and faster communication; and systems that will bring about efficiency in the county government.

There is need for the management of Nairobi county government to design strategies aimed at reducing the effects of political and legislation on strategy implementation, as the study found that politic an legislation negatively affect strategy implementation.

5.5 Suggestion For Further Research

This study sought to establish the challenges of strategy implementation at the Nairobi County Government. The study recommends that a study should be done factors affecting effective implementation of devolved government in Kenya. The study recommends that a study should be done on the effects of strategy implementation on performance of county government.

5.6 Limitation of the Study

The method used is descriptive research design whereby the variables cannot be controlled by the researcher. The study used interview as the instrument for collecting data. This was because time for the data collection was limited to two weeks. The study was carried out in only one county due to financial constraints of the researcher. The study was also limited to establish strategy implementation and performance of county government.

5.7 Implications of the Study on Policy, Theory and Practice

Ineffective strategy implementation is perhaps the most costly item in any organization expenditure. The finding of this study will be of great importance to policy makers as it will help them to come up with factors that delays strategy implementation and those which will hinder their implementation altogether. When such factors are identified, strategies will then be formulated to curb the situation. Strategies that face implementation problems are in most cases those that will give a company the required competitive edge, (Raps and Kauffman, 2005).

This implies that there is direct relationship between strategy implementation and the competitiveness of an organisation. Other factors, however, have led to the same problems. The study will seek to acquire knowledge on actions that ought to be taken to make the whole process of strategy implementation successful. The policy makers will therefore use this study to come up with new way of strategy development in order to curb all the hindrances on the way to their implementation. The policy makers will obtain knowledge of the mobile phone sector dynamics and the process of strategy implementation and how they influence performance.

REFERENCES

- Aaltonen, P., and Ikåvalko, H. (2002), *Implementing strategies successfully*, Integrated Manufacturing Systems, Vol. 13 No.6, pp.415-18
- Andrews, K.R. (1971), *The Concept of Corporate Strategy*, Irwin, Homewood, IL, .
- Ansoff, (1965), *Igor Corporate Strategy* McGraw Hill, New York.
- Balogun, J. (2003), *From blaming the middle to harnessing its potential: creating change intermediaries*, British Journal of Management, Vol. 14 pp.69-83.
- Beer, M., Eisenstat, R. (2000), "The silent killers of strategy implementation and learning", *Sloan Management Review*, Vol. 41 No.4, pp.29-40
- Bourgeois, L.J., and Brodwin, D.R. (1984), *Strategic implementation: five approaches to an elusive phenomenon*, Strategic Management Journal, Vol. 5 pp.241-64.
- Buchanan, K.R. (1994), *The Concept of Corporate Strategy*, Richard D. Irwin, Homewood, IL
- Chaffee, E. (1985) "Three models of strategy", *Academy of Management Review*, vol 10, no. 1.
- Chandler, A. (1962) *Strategy and structure: Chapters in the history of industrial* Doubleday, New York
- Clayton, C., (1997) *The Innovator's Dilemma Boston*: Harvard Business School Press
- Collins, D. (2001a), "BPR and the substance of change", *Journal of Strategic Change*, Vol. 10 No.3, pp.163-73
- Cooke, R.L., Szumal, K.F. (2000), *Measure Up: Yardsticks for Continuous Improvement*, 2nd ed., Blackwell, Oxford
- Creswell, J.W. (1994). *Research Design: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Deninson, T. (1990), "Strategy implementation and project management", *International Journal of Project Management*, Vol. 16 No.1, pp.43-50.
- Denton, G.A., and White, B. (2000), *Implementing the balanced scorecard approach to managing hotel operations*, Cornell HRA Quarterly, No.February, pp.47-107
- Dooley, L.K. (2007). "Introduction to Survey Research Design," SRL Fall - 2002 Seminar Series
- Drazin, R and Howard, P. (1984), *Strategy implementation: a technique for organizational design*, Journal of Management Studies, Vol. 34 No.3, pp.465-85.

- Drucker, R.A. (1958), *Implementing strategy: developing a partnership for change*, Planning Review, Vol. 21 No.5, pp.33-6.
- Forest, J & Kinser, K (2002), *Higher Education in the United States: An Encyclopedia*, ABC-CLIO. Galpin, T., Herndon, M. 2000. *The complete guide to mergers and acquisitions*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.
- Goold, M and Quinn, J.J. (1990), *The paradox of strategic control*, Strategic Management Journal, Vol. 11 pp.43-57.
- Grant, R.M. (2002), *Contemporary Strategy Analysis: Concepts, Techniques, Applications*, Blackwell, Oxford, .
- Grundy, K. (1998), "Management control systems and strategy: a critical review", Accounting Organisations and Society, Vol. 22 No.2, pp.207-32
- Hambrick, D.C., Cannella, A.A. (1989), Strategy implementation as substance and selling, *Academy of Management Executive*, Vol. 3 No.November, pp.278-85
- Hendry, K., Kiel, G.C. (2004), "The role of the board in firm strategy: integrating agency and organizational control perspectives", *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, Vol. 12 pp.500-20.
- Hooley, G.J., Lynch, J.E., Jobber, D. (1992), "*Generic marketing strategies*", International Journal of Research in Marketing, Vol. 9 pp.75-89.
- Jaworski, R.S., Norton, D.P. (1993), *The Strategy-focused Organization: How Balanced Scorecard Companies Thrive in the New Business Environment*, Harvard Business School Press,, Boston, MA., .
- Johnson, D.C., Thurston, A.A. (1997), Strategy implementation as substance and selling, *Academy of Management Executive*, Vol. 3 No.November, pp.278-8.
- Joshi, M.P., Kathuria, R., Porth, S.J. (2003), "Alignment of strategic priorities and performance: an operations perspective", *Journal of Operations Management*, Vol. 21 No.3, pp.353-69.
- Judson, G.A. (1991), *Implementing the balanced scorecard approach to managing hotel operations*, Cornell HRA Quarterly, No.February, pp.47-107
- Kaplan, R.S. (2005) *How the balanced scorecard complements the McKinsey 7-S model*, Strategy & Leadership, Volume: 33, Number: 3, pp: 41-46
- Kothari, C. R. (2004), *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques*. New Delhi: Wiley,

- Lewin, A.Y and Volberda, H.W. (1999), Prolegomena on coevolution: a framework for research on strategy and new organizational forms, *Organization Science*, Vol. 10 No.5, pp. 519-34.
- Lingle, J.H., Schiemann, W.A. (1996), "From balanced scorecard to IS management", *Management Review*, Vol. 85 No.3, pp.56-61.
- Marshall, C., Rossman, G. (1997), *Designing Qualitative Research*, 2nd ed., Sage, London,
- Miller, S and Wilson, D., Hickson, D. (2004), *Beyond planning strategies for successfully implementing strategic decisions*, *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 37 No.1, pp.201-18.
- Mintzberg, H. (1993), *Structure in Fives: Designing Effective Organizations*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, .
- Moorman, C and Miner, A.S. (1998), *The convergence of planning and execution: improvisation in new product development*, *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 62 pp.1-20.
- Mugenda M. O. and Mugenda A. (2003), *Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*, African Centre for Technology Studies, Nairobi, Kenya.
- Nath, D., Sudharshan, D. (1994), "Measuring strategy coherence through patterns of strategic choices", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 15 No.1, pp.43-61.
- Ngechu, D. (2004). *Research Methods in Humanities and Educations*. Nairobi: Egerton University Press.
- Noble, C.H. (1999), *The eclectic roots of strategy implementation research*, *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 45 No.2, pp.119-35.
- Noble, C.H., Mokwa, M.P. (1999), Implementing marketing strategies: developing and testing a managerial theory, *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 63 pp.57-73.
- Nutt, P.C. (1995), *Implementation style and use of implementation approaches*, *International Journal of Management Science*, Vol. 23 No.5, pp.469-84.
- Nyokabi G. C. (2008), Strategy implementation in Kenya Commercial Bank. Unpublished MBA project, University of Nairobi.
- Olson, E.M., Slater, S.F., Hult, G.T.M. (2005), *The importance of structure and process to strategy implementation*, *Business Horizons*, Vol. 48 pp.47-54.

- Otieno, (2001), "Journal of human race and habitation- Squatters in Kenya and how their problems can be addressed", pp24-27.
- Ouchi, W.G. (1980), *Markets, bureaucracies and clans*, Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 25 pp.129-41.
- Parsa, H.G. (1999), *Interaction of strategy implementation and power perceptions in franchise systems: an empirical investigation*, Journal of Business Research, Vol. 45 pp. 173-85.
- Peters, T., Waterman, R. (1982), *In Search of Excellence: Lessons from America's Best Run Companies*, Harper & Row Publishers, New York, NY, .
- Porter, M.E. (1996), *Competitive Strategy: Techniques for Analyzing Industries and Competitors*, Free Press, New York, NY,
- Saunders M, Lewis P and Thornhill A, (2003) *Research Methods for Business Students*, Upper Saddle River, NY: Prentice Hall
- Sun, H., Hong, C. (2002), "The alignment between manufacturing and business strategies: its influence on business performance", *Technovation*, Vol. 22 No.11, pp.699-705.
- Tan, E.W. (2001), *Management control systems and their effects on strategy formation at middle management levels: evidence from a UK organisation*, *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 23 pp.1019-31
- Vemic, B., (2007), *Towards an identification and classification of critical success factors in UK Hotels Plc*, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 15 No.2, pp.113-35
- Wessel, Y. (1993), *Marketing strategy: new directions for theory and research*, *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 47 No.2, pp.12-25.
- West, C.T., Schwenk, C.R. (1996), "Top management team strategic consensus, demographic homogeneity and firm performance: a report of resounding nonfindings", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 17 No.7, pp.571-6.
- Workman, J.P. (1993), *Marketing's limited role in new product development in one computer systems firm*, *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 30 pp.405-21.
- Ye, J.N., Qiu, E. (2004), "Communication: a key factor in strategy implementation", *Planning Review*, Vol. 24 pp.26-30..
- Yin, R. (1994), *Case study research: Design and methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.

APPENDIX

Interview Guide

1. What challenges do you face in formulation and implementation of strategy

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

2. Do think all employees understand what the Nairobi County Government strives to achieve?

Please Elaborate

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

3. Does politics affected strategy implementation in Nairobi county Government?

Please Elaborate

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

4. Does the organisations structure affect strategy implementation at Nairobi county government?

Please Elaborate

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

5. Has the transition from Nairobi City Council to Nairobi County government affected strategy implementation?

Please Elaborate

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

6. Do you think the staff in the county government is well skilled and equipped to implement strategy in the organisation?

Please Elaborate

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

7. Has government policy and legislation affected strategy implementation in Nairobi county?

Please Elaborate

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

8. Does the organisation have sufficient systems and technology for their strategy implement?

Please Elaborate

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

9. Are there other forces that are opposed to Nairobi government's strategic intent?

Please Elaborate

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

THANK YOU