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# ABSTRACT

Government policy formulation and implementation is an important component of the strategic policy management process. It is clear that there is a high failure rate of policy implementation efforts. These failures are the result of a number of issues in the internal and external environments of organizations. The purpose of this study was to determine the factors affecting effective strategy implementation and formulation in county governments in Kenya with a focus on Trans Nzoia County Government. The study specifically sought to establish whether organizational structure, organizational capabilities and organizational culture influence strategy implementation in the county governments in Kenya.

This study used descriptive research design. The target population of this study was 139 comprising of the county leaders in Trans Nzoia County Government who include governor, deputy governor, chief of staff, county secretary, county public service board members, county executive committee members, chief officers, directors, speaker of county assembly, assembly clerk and the county assembly service board members. This study used distributive proportionate stratified random sampling to select the sample size of 66 from target population. The study used Primary data collected by use of questionnaires. Descriptive statistics used include measures of central tendencies (mean), measures of dispersion (standard deviation), frequencies and percentages. Data was then presented in tables, charts and graphs. For this purpose, regression analysis was used to illustrate the relationship between the independent variables which were organizational structure, capabilities and culture and the dependent variable which was strategy implementation and formulation. Principally, the results indicated that organizational structure, organizational capabilities and organizational culture affect strategy implementation and formulation in county governments. The study sought to answer the research questions. On determination whether organizational structure have an effect on strategy implementation and formulation in county government in Kenya, this study found out that organizational structure had R= 0.870 P= 0.069 (p< 0.1) indicating a strong relationship which was statistically significant as 90% confidence level. Therefore, organizational structure as an independent variable could be used to explain strategy implementation as a dependent variable.
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# 1.0 CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Background of the Study

World over, whereas many practitioners and scholars alike believe that crafting an innovative and unique strategic plan is critical and by itself satisfactory to guide an organization to success, ensuring that such a strategy is properly executed is equally as important. Rajasekar (2014) argued that top management and organizational executives should pay careful attention to the implementation of strategies to avoid common pitfalls that result in failure. A number of approaches that greatly enhance the effectiveness of strategy implementation can be employed. Indeed, good strategic management is a function of people actively considering strategy as they make day-to-day decisions in an ever-changing world. On implementation, Kurendi (2013) expressed that the adoption of strategies in organizations depict that organizations engage in the crafting of strategy, which, if effectively executed would guarantee organization success and sustainable development. Therefore, strategy implementation is a key component of the strategic thinking and management process.

Strategy implementation is the amplification and understanding of a new strategy within an organization (Mintzberg, 1994). Such an explanation involves the development of new structures, institutionalization of organizational culture, developing organizational capabilities and processes, and other organizational alignments (Galbraith & Kazanjian, 2015; Mbaka & Mugambi, 2014). Implementation is a key stage of the strategy process, but one which has been relatively neglected (Bantel & Osborn, 2001). Despite this it is generally perceived as a highly significant determinant of performance. As Noble (1999) stated that a well formulated strategies only produce superior performance for the organization when they are successfully implemented. There seems to be widespread agreement in the literature regarding the nature of strategic planning, which includes strategy implementation. It includes presentations of various models showing the organizational characteristics such as organizational structure, systems, culture, resources and capabilities suggested as significant factors for effective strategy implementation (Guffy, 1992). It is also portrayed as a lively process by which companies identify future opportunities (Reid, 2016). Additionally, the existence of a strategy is an essential condition or precondition for strategy implementation and formulation. Implementation is focused by nature and by definition. It cannot be directionless. It is a process defined by its purpose – in this case, the realization of a strategy (Mbaka & Mugambi, 2014). Thus, to implement a strategy, there must be a strategy.

The strategy may be more or less well formed, more or less in the process of formation, or even emergent (Mintzberg, 1994). Unless it is suitably formed to represent a direction or goal, there is nothing to implement; and organizational members will be unable to work towards its realization. As a result, strategic intentions are inextricably linked with, and enable the existence of, strategy implementation. As well, organizations that focus their energy on harvesting the fluid relationship between strategy implementation will create satisfied customers, employees and improved livelihoods among people served (Beaudan, 2001). There are several studies indicating factors that affect effective strategy implementation. These factors are both internally and externally to the organization. Internal factors include organization structure, organization culture, leadership, company resources, strategies, rewards and staff motivation. External factors include economic and political, ecological, technology and globalization, and government regulations (Kurendi, 2013). According to David (2003), many excellent strategies fail when attempts to implement them are made.

The implementation phase involves identifying the required resources and putting in place the necessary organizational changes needed to make the whole process a success. Organizational structure and Leadership: Organization structure consists of activities such as task allocation, coordination and supervision, directed towards the achievement of organizational aims. It simply means the formal framework by which job tasks are divided, grouped, and coordinated (Robins & Coulter, 2002). There is an intrinsic association between strategy formulation and structure of the organization. The structures facilitate or constrain how the process and relationships work, hence affecting strategy implementation process (Thompson, Strickland, Gamble & Jain, 2006). From existing strategy implementation literature, the strategic failure in organization for both profit and not-for profit lie between 50% and 80% (Raps, 2004; Atkinson, 2006; Rajasekar, 2014). Contributing to this, Herbiniak (2016) found out that strategy execution is commonly the most complicated and time-consuming part of strategic management, while strategy formulation is primarily an intellectual and creative act involving analysis and synthesis. This calls for keenness by executives towards strategy execution besides crafting of elaborate strategies.

World over, as stated by Cater and Pucko (2010) implementation of strategies has been a key driver of the emergence of strategic management in late 20th century. Egelhoff (1993) investigated whether organizations are looking for great strategy or great strategy implementation by analyzing Asian organizations that have competed successfully by focusing on the implementation of not so distinctive strategies instead of attempting to develop unique strategies. By comparing US and Japanese semiconductor industries, Egelhoff found that the frequent repositioning of American organizations had a greater impact on other American companies and a lesser impact on Japanese organizations that are busy implementing their long-term product line and market segment strategies (Rajasekar, 2014). From Zaribaf and Bayrami (2010) majority of large organizations had problems with strategy implementation. The literature supports the view that unlike strategy formulation, strategy implementation cannot be achieved by top management alone; it requires the collaboration of everyone inside the organization and, on many occasions, parties outside the organization. While formulating a strategy is normally a top-down endeavor, implementing it requires simultaneous top-down, bottom-up, and across efforts (Herbiniak, 2016). Although numerous studies have defined organizational culture, measured its components/constructs, and associated it with components of organizational success and change (Mallinger, Goodwin & O’Hara, 2009), very few have connected a reliable and predictive measure of organizational culture to implementation outcomes.

In Kenya, it is evident that while organizations formulate strategy, implementation is what determines their performance (Machuki, 2011). Various authors who have studied factors that affect strategy implementation described strategy implementation as the dynamic, interactive and complex process, which is comprised of a series of decisions and activities by managers and employees; which is affected by a number of interrelated internal and external factors – to turn strategic plans into reality in order to achieve strategic objectives (Abdalla, 2014) More studies in Kenya on strategy implementation indicate that the internal and external factors that influence strategy implementation in organizations include leadership, style of management, resources, customs, culture, systems, structure, organizational politics as well as information communication technology.

Manyarkiy (2006), Ngumo (2006) and Obare (2006) authenticated in their studies those aspects such as lack of dedication from the leadership, meager organizational framework, scarcity of resources, contradictory interests of individuals and that of the organization, and poor communication influence strategy implementation. Sterling (2003), listed application of insufficient resources, failures of buy in, understanding, and/or communication, and a lack of focus as some of the factors that lead to the failure of strategy implementation. Raps (2015) lists ten checklist items that have to be set in motion, failure to which the implementation of the strategy is bound to fail. Zaribaf (2009), listed organizational structure, leadership, and human resource as the top three factors (in that order) that affected strategy implementation in a survey done on for a global company. Hailed as the great compromise of Kenya’s (2010) Constitution, devolution was one of the hallmarks of the transition from a previously centralized political system, which was largely blamed for vast inequality, exclusion and deep divisions in Kenyan society (Mugambi 2013). Devolution is a form of decentralization. It is simply defined as the process of transferring decision-making and implementation powers, functions, responsibilities and resources to legally constituted, and popularly elected local governments.

Devolution in Kenya is based on the supremacy of the Constitution, sovereignty of the people and the principle of public participation (ICJ, 2013). Devolution is one of the concepts in the Constitution that has brought about a complete overhaul in Kenya’s system of governance. This is because it is a new aspect in the Kenyan governance system. The need for Devolution has been seen in many countries and it is informed by the need to have power sharing, checks and balances in governance and the decentralization of resources. Unlike the regional governments in the old system, county governments have full prerogatives that allow them to manage and develop their own affairs while fostering, social, economic and political development. Hence, some of the areas their powers extend to include agriculture, healthcare, transport, trade development and regulation, planning and development and pre-primary education (Mugambi, 2013). National and county governments are expected to work in consultation, exchange of information respect for respective organs institution and structures (Burugu, 2010). This co-operation policy will enhance national unity, harmonized policy formulation, coordination of socioeconomic policies, implementation of legislation, administration enhancing capacity and facilitation of county and senate government operations. Each level of government should exercise integrity and respect constitutional functional status and government institutions of every level as the constitution provides for enhanced and closer working relationship, joint working committees may be formed for negotiation, mediation and arbitration during disputes (Kipkorir, 2009). Specifically, constitution provides that the territory of Kenya is divided into forty-seven (47) counties as specified in the First Schedule to the Constitution. Furthermore, in the fourth schedule, there are fourteen functions (14) of the county government clearly stipulated that include;

1. Agriculture,
2. County health services,
3. Control of air pollution, noise pollution, other public nuisances and outdoor advertising,
4. Cultural activities, public entertainment and public amenities,
5. County transport,
6. Animal control and welfare,
7. Trade development and regulation
8. County planning and development,
9. Pre-primary education, village polytechnics, home craft centers and childcare facilities;
10. Implementation of specific national government policies on natural resources and environmental conservation
11. County public works and services,
12. Firefighting services and disaster management,
13. Control of drugs and pornography; and
14. Ensuring and coordinating the participation of communities and locations in governance at the local level and assisting communities and locations to develop the administrative capacity for the effective exercise of the functions and powers and participation in governance at the local level (CoK, 2010).

## 1.2 Statement of the Problem

Successful strategy implementation and formulation is a key for any organization’s survival. Rajasekar (2014) noted that organization could not effectively deliver services despite having a robust strategy formulation process, because they lack the processes in implementing the strategies. Several issues affect the effective implementation and formulation of strategies. Herbiniak (2016) observed that the success or failures of strategy implementation and formulation revolve around the nature of strategy itself, resource allocation, and the fit between strategy and structure, leadership and organization culture. Further work on this by Omondi, Ombui and Mungatu (2013) found out that policy regulations, managerial competencies and resource allocations are the critical factors that affect the effective strategy implementation. Considering the higher failure rates in implementation of strategies, more attention should be given by executives to implementing the strategy. While this field of research attracted significant research interests and subsequently added quality theories and models in the western world, this topic has not attracted much attention in the Africa and particularly Kenya in the public sector. Hence, this study seeks to investigate the strategy implementation and formulation processes followed in county governments in Kenya.

Several studies have been carried out on different aspects of strategy implementation and formulation in both the private and public sector organizations in Kenya. The scholars include Abdalla (2014), Kurendi (2013); Nabwire (2014); Omondi, Ombui and Mungatu (2013), Machuki (2011) among others. Fewer researchers like Manyarkiy (2006) and Mbaka & Mugambi 2014) focused on strategic implementation and formulation in public organizations in Kenya. However, there is no empirical evidence that has been conducted on the factors affecting the implementation and formulation of strategy in the county governments in Kenya.

In transition from the old to new constitution in Kenya presents fear of the unknown, anxiety, apprehension, hope, and enthusiasm on the other hand (Omari, Kaburi & Sewe, 2011). Although the devolved system is based on the constitutional mandates and responsibilities, jitters still prevail due to the issues surrounding effective implementation and formulation of set strategies as defined by the mandated county integrated development plans among other strategic planning documents. Such issues include organizational structure, competence of public officers, and style of leaders and availability of financial resources (Bantel & Osborn, 2016). However, there is no empirical evidence that has conducted on the factors affecting the implementation and formulation of strategy in the county governments. It is against these backdrops, this study sought to investigate the factors affecting effective strategy implementation and formulation in the county governments in Kenya.

## 1.3Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the factors affecting effective strategy implementation in county governments in Kenya, a case of Trans Nzoia County Government

### 1.3.0 Research Objectives

The study was guided by the following research questions:

To what extent does organizational structure have an effect on strategy implementation and formulation in county government in Kenya?

To what extent does an organizational capability have an effect on strategy implementation and formulation in county government in Kenya?

To what extent does organizational culture have an effect on strategy implementation and formulation in county government in Kenya?

## 1.4 Importance of the study

The research will be beneficial to various stakeholders as enumerated below

### 1.4.1 County Governments

The main importance of this study is to reveal the possible factors that affect strategy implementation and formulation in county governments in Kenya. Majority of research finds that organizational structure, culture and capabilities are key factors that affect strategy implementation and formulation. By assessing these factors of strategy implementation in county governments in Kenya, interested parties such as development partners, investors, county executives, public officers, speculators, analysts and practitioners in general may find this study useful. The practitioners will be able to examine key factors that determine strategy implementation and thus influence service delivery to electorates.

### 1.4.2 Policy Makers

The policy makers in devolved institutions in Kenya and beyond will gain immensely in setting the public sector policy on strategic management and particularly making strategies work. More so, agencies such as the Council of Governors and Ministry of Devolution and Planning when formulating policies relating to county planning and execution will be informed by the findings of this study.

### 1.4.3 Academia

Finally, this study will contribute to the young and growing field of strategic management; researchers can explore the findings of this study for further research in the comprehension and responding to strategy implementation in the contemporary world.

## 1.5 Scope of the Study

The study was on the county governments in Kenya focusing on the factors that affect effective strategy implementation and formulation in the devolved institutions. Particularly, the study focused on Trans Nzoia County Government. When assessing strategy implementation, the study assessed three critical elements, namely: organizational structure, organizational capabilities and organizational culture. Specifically, the target population was the county leaders in the Trans Nzoia County Government who included the governor, deputy governor, chief of staff, county secretary, county public service board members, county executive committee members, chief officers, directors, speaker of county assembly, assembly clerk and the county assembly service board members.

## 1.6 Limitations of the study

They are inevitable in any research, this not being exceptional. Some of the information sought was deemed confidential and some of the respondents could be reluctant to give critical information necessary to the study. This was countered by the researcher contacting both arms of county government of Trans Nzoia with notifications to the Governor and the Speaker of the National Assembly given in advance on distribution of questionnaires. Additionally, the researcher reassured the county government that the research was only for academic purpose and would not be used in any other area. The researcher also foresaw failed responses, maybe too busy to fill the questionnaires. This was countered by the researcher through use of electronic mail to collect information.

## 1.7 Definition of Terms

### 1.7.1 County Government

Refers to a political subdivision, which are created within a state for the exercise of duties and responsibilities granted by constitutional provisions or legislative enactments. It is the lowest level through which representative government can be practiced (Omari, Kaburi & Sewe, 2011).

### 1.7.2 Organizational Capabilities

These are distinct behavioral patterns, which are complex in nature involving both formal and informal processes (Dosi, Hobday & Marengo, 2003).

### 1.7.3 Organizational Culture

Organizational culture represents those expectations, norms, and goals held in common by members of a particular group (Deresky, 2008)

### 1.7.4 Organizational Structure

Organizational structure is the arrangement of duties use for the work to be done and comprises of tasks and levels of authority which is best represented by the organization chart (Jackson & Morgan, 1982). In other words, organizational structure is the 10 architecture of business competence, leadership, talent, functional relationships and arrangement (Wolf, 2002).

### 1.7.5 Strategy

This is the organizational direction and scope in the long run; which enhances service delivery in an ever-changing environment through its alignment of both intangible and tangible resources with the aim of gratifying stakeholder anticipations (Johnson, Scholes & Whittington, 2005).

### 1.7.6 Strategy Implementation

This is making strategies work that is, effecting the strategies set that show the connecting loop between formulation and control (Herbiniak, 2016).

# 2.0 CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

## 2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviews literature on factors affecting implementation of strategy. The chapter is arranged according to the research questions. The first section focuses on the relationship between organizational structure and strategy implementation and formulation. The second section focuses on the relationship between organizational capabilities and strategy implementation and formulation and the third section focuses on the relationship between organizational culture and strategy implementation and formulation.

## 2.2 Organizational Structure and Strategy Implementation and formulation

Organizational structure is defined as the roles, responsibilities and lines of reporting in an organization (Johnson, Kevan & Richard, 2006). It can deeply influence the sources of an organization’s advantage, in terms of knowledge management. If the organizations’ structure does not match the company’s strategy, it may prove fatal in its implementation and formulation. The structural design describes who is responsible for what. It also provides clarity on decision making, communication line and knowledge exchange. This will help employees to easily receive feedback from top and middle management without fear of distortion (Johnson, Scholes & Whittington, 2006).

Contributing to organizational structure, Pearce and Robinson (2011) expressed that this deals with formalized arrangement of interaction between responsibility of tasks, people, and resources in an organization. They also describe an organizational structure as a chart often pyramidal with roles and titles in cascading fashion (Pearce & Robinson, 2011). In other words, organizational structure as a formal grouping of the organization is logistic and managerial activities (Ansoff & McDonnell, 1990).

Organizational structure provides the structural alternatives as divisional, multinational, matrix and innovative structures. There are seven basic structural types mentioned by Johnson et al., (2006) namely: functional, multidivisional, holding company, matrix, transnational, team-based and project-based structures. Functional structure which is based on the activities of the organization such as production, finance and accounting, marketing, human resources and research and development. Multidivisional structure, which is based on products, services or geographical areas. Holding company structure which consists of shareholdings in a variety of separate business operations. Matrix structure, which is a combination of structures which take the form of products and geographical divisions or functional and divisional structures operating together (Johnson et al., 2006).

Transnational structure combines the local responsiveness of the international subsidiary with the coordination advantages found in global product companies. Team-based structure combines both horizontal and vertical coordination through structuring people into cross-functional teams. Finally, there is a project-based structure where teams are created to a specific task then dissolved (Johnson et al., 2006)). Tavitiyaman, Zhang, and Qu (2012), indicate that types of organizational structures correspond to different abilities of the company to process information and is distinguished between mechanistic and organic structure. A mechanistic structure is highly formalized, non-participative, hierarchical, tightly controlled and inflexible. An organic structure on the other hand is defined by its informality, decentralization of authority, open channels of communication and flexibility. Pearce and Robinson (2011) perspective of organizational structures are similar to those described by Johnson et.al, (2006) but he included product-team structure which seeks to simplify and amplify the focus of resources on a narrow but strategically important product, project, market, customer, or innovation. Some of the highlights when reviewing how organization design and structure affects strategy implementation in this study will be authority, degree of centralization, degree of integration and formalization (Bhimani & Langfield, 2015).

### 2.2.1 Authority in Strategy Implementation

Authority is viewed as the managerial force that enables one to lead the project independently without the need of approval for any decision, move or step, throughout the project (Ana Shetach, 2010). In other words, authority as characterized by staffing, coordination, organizing and reporting relations. In bureaucratic and mechanistic structures, they are well suited for mass production in a stable environment. Mechanic structures are mainly characterized by different hierarchical levels, and the reporting channel is usually from the top management through a long process of downward communication to get to the employees. By the time the information gets to the employees it is filtered and only part of it is communicated (Martínez-León & Martíne García, 2011). Bhimani and Langfield (2015) noted that authority is associated with coordination which is achieved through intense work division, which generates high work specialization and differentiation with specialized role and responsibilities. This therefore implies that there are functional grouping and rigid departmental separation (Martínez-León & Martínez García, 2011). In Organic and decentralized structures, the organization is characterized by a flat and horizontal shape with possibly three layers of management between the top and the front line. The company receives knowledge through the employees who operate as independent and separate. Middle level management communicates the continuous interactive process by which knowledge is created. There is therefore decentralization in the way the organization is structured (Bhimani & Langfield, 2015). In a simple organizational structure, the authority is very demanding on the owner of the business (Pearce & Robinson, 2007). If successful it may give increased attention to day to-day activities which may be an expense in terms of time invested. In functional organizational structure it differentiates and delegates the day-to-day operating decisions though it limits the development of general managers. In divisional structure, it frees the chief executive officer for broader strategic decisions though it creates a room for potential inconsistency among divisions. In the matrix structure it maximizes efficient use of functional managers as well as gives the middle level managers broader exposure to strategic issues. However, in companies with high power distance the leadership tends to be autocratic as they will tend to view others as indecisive and too compromising (Rugman & Collinson, 2016).

### 2.2.2 Degree of Integration

Zynger, Burstein and McKay (2014) posited that a leader must investigate the knowledge and alignment needs with the organizational strategy. Leaders must also plan and execute the management strategy to support the value proposition and to define the organization’s mission. Leadership is widely recognized as being fundamental in the integration of strategy in an organization (Zyngieret al., 2014). Organizations must be able to develop and implement strategies while meeting the expectations of shareholders, employees, suppliers, creditors, clients, institutions, communities and societies in general (Antonio, 14 2015). Ouriques (2009,) mentions that organizations that outline their management strategy in line with the organization structure and design have been improving their performance. When it comes to strategy implementation process of a company, ethics and balance must be considered in the integration between economic, social, environmental elements and the corporate identity (Simas, Lengler, & Antonio, 2013). Norman and MacDonald (2003) advise that that many companies whether small or large, governments and political parties among others have put into practice the idea of being able to assess companies not only in economic terms but also in social and environmental terms, so that all stakeholders benefit (Norman & MacDonald, 2013).

### 2.2.3 Degree of Centralization & Decentralization

Martínez-León and Martínez-García (2011) observed that in mechanistic organizational structures there is high centralization and relational complexity resulting from the managers’ need to coordinate the organizational activities required to develop the vision of their planning control and continuous intervention in problem resolution, decision-making and management. In addition, organic structures are mainly suited to industries with low rates of technical, market change hence helps management to monitor cost effectiveness, and quality (Tavitiyaman, Zhang, & Qu, 2012).

Mechanistic structures are ideal for carrying out particular, unusual tasks that frequently change because the specialization of tasks is based on knowledge. In a simple organizational structure, the company is reliant on the owner as the central point for all decisions hence can limit development. In a functional structure, it retains a centralized control of strategic decisions hence has a strong potential for inter-functional conflicts due to priorities placed in particular functions (Pearce & Robinson, 2011). In a divisional structure, it retains functional specialization within each division though there are higher chances increased costs through duplication of efforts (Pearce & Robinson, 2011). It is fundamental in an environment characterized by high dynamism, complexity, hostility and uncertainty where the organization have to be guided to continuous change, learning and innovation (Martínez-León & Martínez-García, 2011). A recent study has shown that formalization and decentralization have a positive effect on performance (Herbiniak, 2016).

### 2.2.4 Degree of Formalization

Pearce and Robinson (2011) described formality in strategy implementation and formulation as the degree to which participants’ responsibilities; authority and discretion in decision-making are specified. In mechanistic structures a high degree of specialization creates room for experts and the high formalization reduces the capacity for improvising and creating new competences. The structure is therefore to assist with routine problems but it is unable to cope with new ideas. This therefore reinforces past behaviors and inhibits rapid response to the competitive environment (Martínez-León & Martínez-García, 2011). It is also more suited to environments where change is rapid and prefers a minimal degree of hierarchy. Tavitiyaman, Zhang and Qu (2012) posited that formalization is viewed in terms of flexibility in staff work activities.

### 2.2.5 Organization Process

In strategy implementation, organization structure and organization processes are related as they both pursue a defined strategy (Chandler, 1962). Organization process can help or stop the implementation of strategy into action. Organization process can either be divided into input and output process or direct and indirect controls. Inputs process is based on resource consumed in strategy in particular financial resources and human commitment. The output processes ensure satisfactory results. The direct controls involve close supervision or monitor while indirect controls on the other hand is hands off. An organization may use a blend of these conditions but some will dominate over others according to the strategic challenges (Johnson et al., 2006).

### 2.2.6 Management Levels, Functions and Operational Systems

Raps (2015) identified three levels of management and decision making that is highlighted as a pyramid to show their hierarchy. Starting from the bottom of the pyramid the levels are operational or functional level, administrative level and strategic or corporate level. The corporate level is the senior or top level of management and they make decisions that have a long-term effect in the direction of the entire organization. The middle level managers make tactical decisions that focus on intermediate-term issues to fulfil the organizations missions, objectives and strategy. Finally, the operational or low-level managers, supervisors and workers need detailed data and decision-making is for the immediate or day to day activities or operations (Raps, 2015).

## 2.3 Organizational Capabilities and Strategy Implementation

Organizational capabilities in terms of human, information, communications technological, and leadership are the organization's strategic strength and the unique resources that affect many services delivered as well as strategy implementation in organizations (Johnson & Scholes, 2002). The various components that define organizational capabilities include human competences, information, communications and technological capabilities, leadership competences and reputational capabilities.

### **2.3.1 Human Competences**

Human competences are measured in terms of individual knowledge of people employed by an organization that is about clearly defined core knowledge, skills and abilities (Gill & Delahaye, 2014). In other words, human competences are the companies’ activities directed at managing the pool of human capital and ensuring that the capital is employed toward the fulfilment of organizational goals. This leads to recognizing two aspects of human competences. McKelvey (2016) noted that the focus is on the knowledge, skills, and abilities inherent in the individuals that make up the organization. Flamholtz and Lacey (2014) posited that application of human capital theory focuses directly on the skills of human beings in organizations. McKelvey (2016), on the other hand, seeks to Geno-typically classify organizations based on what he refers to as their competencies. In his model, these competencies are found in the knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSA's) of organizational members.

Both of these approaches recognize the importance of the individual members of organizations as the important resource, rather than the practices and/or procedures used by the organization. Therefore, in this study will seek to show human capabilities has an influence on strategy implementation. In order for human competences enhances strategy implementation and formulation, they must provide value to the organization. Steffy and Maurer (2013) pointed out that organization’s specific human capital theory provides an examination of the conditions under which human value creation is and is not possible. According to this theory, when both the demand for labor is homogeneous (i.e., employees are perfectly substitutable) and supply of labor is also homogeneous (all employees and potential employees are equal in their productive capacity), there is no variance in individual contribution to the organization. In this situation, it is not possible to create value through investment in human assets. However, Steffy and Maurer (2013) noted that, in fact, both the demand for labor is heterogeneous (i.e., organizations have different jobs which require different skills) and the supply of labor is heterogeneous (i.e., individuals differ in both the types and level of their skills). Thus, there is variance in individuals' contribution value to the organization. This argues that human capital can create value for the organization therefore influencing strategy implementation (Steffy & Maurer, 2013).

### 2.3.2 Information, Communications and Technological Capabilities

Information technology (IT) is an essential tool, commonly accepted today that has significant effects on service delivery in the public sector to enhance effective strategy implementation (Su, 2015). These effects will only be fully realized if, and when, IT are widely spread and used. There are different forms required for county governments that create a new type of services with ICT applications, such as use of computers, online services, website platforms; use of surveillance systems, integrated revenue collection, integrated financial management software and integrated human resources management software. Therefore, it is necessary for county government to fasten service delivery through faster information transmission (Fu, et. al., 2004).

A public sector service model innovation can change beyond current practice in one or more elements of a county government service delivery model and their interdependencies, thereby modifying the organization’s organizing logic for strategy implementation (Sorescuet al., 2011). Information technology (IT) is generally considered an enabler of an organization’s agility to implement set strategy (Su, 2015). The use of information technology to support knowledge creation process dynamically, the researcher has consistently chosen to adopt terminology of organizational learning. Organizational learning is about exploration and exploitation. Exploration involves the development of new knowledge or replacing existing content within the organization memory (Pentland, 2015). Exploitation refers to improvement, and use of knowledge (Larsson et al., 2014).

Information and communications technological system can affect both exploration and exploitation (Pentland, 2015). Information and communications technological competence is fundamental to human existence (Burke & Ornstein, 1995). At each stage within the cycle of life, humans continuously strive to acquire new skills, or to refine existing ones, in the hope that productivity and quality of life will be enhanced. Despite the fact that skilled behavior underlies nearly every human activity, our understanding about the factors that contribute to the attainment of expertise in technology education is far from complete. However, some attempts to define information and communications technological competence have been made. For example, Audio and Hansen (2002) defined information and communications technological competence as an interrelationship between technical abilities in psychomotor, cognitive, and affective areas. Defining and measuring information and communications technological competence as a construct was achieved by extending the work of Layton (2014).

They identified three components that correspond with what the authors considered to be the dimensions of information and communications technological competence. The first is information and communications technological knowledge; according to Layton (2014), know something about information and communications technological concepts, principles, and connections, as well as the nature and history of technology. The second dimension of information and communications technological competence is information and communications technological skill. Technical and information and communications technological skills are part of most human activities and are essential for the survival of humankind. These skills are often labelled by psychologists as psychomotor skills and are an important component of information and communications technological competence (Layton, 2014). They involve tactile or kinesthetic ability, as well as practical intelligence. Such skills include manual coordination and steadiness when using welding or soldering equipment, for example. The third dimension is information and communications technological will, or being active and enterprising with regard to technology. Technology is determined and guided by human emotions, motivations, values, and personal qualities. Thus, the development of technology in society is dependent on citizens’ information and communications technological will to participate in, and have an impact on, information and communications technological decisions (individual and/or societal). This is the affective or emotional aspect of information and communications technological competence. Information and communications technological competence, in short, involves a balance between knowledge, skill, and emotional engagement. In its fullest sense, it is the act of using human ingenuity, or, being ingenious (Hansen, 2008).

### 2.3.3 Leadership Competences

Strategic leaders have the ability to develop strategic capabilities. Prahalad and Hamel (1990) use the term ‘core competencies’ while Stalk et al. (2012) use the term ‘strategic capabilities. Leadership abilities enable a company to successfully meet new challenges by reconfiguring existing abilities and resources rather than having to seek new ones. The questions that strategic leaders ask is: ‘What strategic capabilities do I need to sustain and develop for the future?’ as well as ‘How do I meet current challenges?’ By focusing on strategic capabilities, leaders position themselves and their organizations to be sustainable and successful in the longer term.

In other words, leadership competences are those abilities to undertake organizational activity and, second, individual abilities: strategic leaders have the organizational ability to: be strategically orientated; translate strategy into action; align people and organizations; determine effective strategic intervention points; develop strategic competencies; a dissatisfaction or restlessness with the present; absorptive capacity; adaptive capacity; and wisdom (Kimberly & Hooijberg, 2012). Leadership competences are the capabilities organizational managers possess in order to create and maintain absorptive and adaptive capacity in addition to obtaining managerial wisdom. They include the absorptive capacity that involves the ability to learn by recognizing new information, assimilating it, and applying it; the adaptive capacity that involves the ability to change due to variations in conditions; and the managerial wisdom that consists of discernment and intuition (Kimberly & Hooijberg, 2012).

Strategic leaders have a dissatisfaction or restlessness with the present. This restlessness involves what Senge (1990) describes as ‘creative tension’ which emerges from seeing clearly where one wishes to be, one’s vision, and facing the truth about one’s current reality. Strategic leaders are able to envision the ‘strategic leap’ that an organization wants to make, while acting as passionate advocates for change. Strategic leaders have the ability to live with the reality that the organizational culture may not be as forward thinking as they do. It is the ability to live with the ambiguity of not being able to change the organization fast enough, with the ability to maintain the restlessness for change and improvement. Strategic leaders have absorptive capacity. Cohen and Levinthal (1990) define absorptive capacity as the ability to absorb new information and assimilate it and learn from it and importantly to apply it to new ends. Hambrick (2016) argues that strategic leadership occurs in an environment embedded in ambiguity, complexity and informational overload. It is important therefore for strategic leaders to recognize new information, analyses it and apply it to new outcomes; leaders need the ability to learn. Boal and Hooijberg (2015) also call this ‘absorptive capacity’ and argue that leaders ‘have a unique ability to change or reinforce existing action patterns’ within the organization. Therefore, strategic leaders should create an organizational context where learning can take place. This may make use of Argyris and Schon’s (1978) double-loop learning. What is important is that strategic leaders filter out the unimportant and make sense of the important for themselves and their organization.

The critical nature of their position often means their interpretation of reality determines patterns of action within the organization (Boal & Hooijberg, 2015). Strategic leaders have adaptive capacity. Hambrick (2016) define the ability to change as ‘adaptive capacity’. Sanders (2014) supports this view that strategic leaders need the ability to change and learn through asserting that ‘mastering chaos, complexity and change’ requires new ways of ‘seeing and thinking’. Whittington (2014) suggests that ‘leaders need an enduring sense of purpose and a continuous sense of motivation’. This can be seen in Hittet al.’s (2008) term of ‘strategic flexibility’. In an era of innovation and continuous learning where success may depend on a flexible strategic response, this is particularly important and may favor the emergent strategy or the strategic intent approach. Linking to Davies’ (2016) concept of ‘strategic opportunism’, leaders position themselves to take significant opportunities as they adapt to new information in a responsive and proactive way. Leaders can adapt and lead new strategic direction for the organization if they have cognitive flexibility linked to a mind-set that welcomes and accepts change. Strategic leaders have leadership wisdom. Wisdom may simply be defined as the capacity to take the right action at the right time. Sternberg (2012) articulated those leaders need wisdom because: one need creative abilities to come up with ideas; on need analytical abilities to decide whether ideas are good ideas; one need practical abilities to make your ideas functional and to convince others of the value of your ideas; and one need wisdom to balance the effects of ideas on yourself, others and organizations in both the short and long run (Kimberly & Hooijberg, 2012).

### 2.3.4 Reputational Capabilities

Reputational capabilities according to Hooley et al., 2005consist of organization reputation and image, brand reputation and image. Managing reputation is actually about managing the risks around relationships with different publics. Strategic management theory suggests that favorable reputations affect strategy implementation and affect service delivery and overall performance (Fombrun & Rindova, 2016). Reputation takes the form of an intangible asset that is closely tied to the organization and available to use over the long term (Wernerfelt, 2014). Corporate and brand reputation are among the few remaining tools that organizations can use for differentiation. A strong reputation offers the leading organization a valuable resource that it can continue to exploit to sustain its position in the market. Reputational resources enhance trust and confidence (credibility) in the organization, leading individuals to feel safe in using their services, applying for jobs within the organization, choosing not to boycott the organization’s service offering during a crisis, and so forth (Dowling, 2014).

## 2.4 Organizational Culture and Strategy Implementation

Organizational culture is an entirety of acquired values, ethics and customs that are supposed to guide the behavior of people of a certain society. Culture or civilization is the multifaceted whole that consists of awareness, faith, art, ethics, regulations, traditions, and any other abilities and customs obtained by man as a member of a particular society (Peng & Litteljohn, 2001). Higgins (2005) defines organizational culture as the fundamental suppositions and values that are commonly shared by people in an organization that is run reflexively. For an organization to function efficiently there has to be a commonly acknowledged set of postulations. Johnson et al. (2006) refers to these combined, lightly considered suppositions as the model of an organization. Homburg, Krohmer and Workman (2014) acknowledged the key aspects of community culture as; joint values, joint beliefs and customs. These joint values and beliefs of members of an organization are interconnected with the organizations’ framework, management systems, and the people who come up with the norms.

Corporate culture is a result of lasting social education. At times, it is an indication of what has performed well in the earlier period though presupposed and moved to the subsequent generation of workers. This is as a routine custom of perceiving and behaving. Hrebiniak (2016) defines corporate culture as the nature of an organization’s internal job climate and individuality as fashioned by its major values, business principles, customs, entrenched behaviors, job practices as well as method of operating. They restate that an organization’s culture is significant, since it greatly affects the organizations events and approach' to daily activities. They mention corporate culture as the organization’s DNA (Hantang, 2005). Save for corporate culture advancing an organizations capacity to employ fresh strategies, it helps it to attain higher altitudes in excellence. Comparative research studies showed that the proportional accomplishments by Japanese organizations as contrasted to American organizations could be partially explained by their well-built organizational cultures that do emphasize on employee contribution, open communication as well as job security (Harrington, 2006). Thus, plans and objectives must be set up within an organization to give support as well as establish a culture that is of the organization, which up holds the strategy of the organization over time.

Today, not most organizations can survive without having a very strong and enduring advantageous culture. The study pertaining to organizational culture started in the 1980s and today it has been assimilated by the current human styles and values of development that have led to a new era in enterprises. There exists a consensus on the idea that organizations attempting to instill communication amongst its members and to motivate employees to challenge the fundamental beliefs will be successful in attaining a working atmosphere (Tampoe & Macmillan, 2000). An organization’s culture requires the acknowledgement by the management of the underlying dimensions of their corporate culture together with its impact on employee-related variables for instance commitment, satisfaction, cohesion, performance and strategy implementation and formulation (Slater & Olson, 2001). Numerous studies have attempted to create conceptual models to test the influence of organization (Sterling, 2003). When it is a question of efficiency in service delivery, only organizations that implement almost all of their strategies achieve it. However, very few studies have studied the effect of culture on strategy implementation (Schiffman & Kanuk, 2014). The significance of culture as an encouraging and unifying factor, it is considered as part of the implementation process. It is paramount to measure the cultures that will help an organization implement its strategic objectives. Studies on the effect of organizational culture on organizational variables became widespread in the 1980s. Sterling (2003), postulated that the 1980s witnessed a surge in popularity to examine the concept of organizational culture as managers became increasingly aware of the ways that an organizational culture can affect employees and organizations. Leading journals since then have come with a definition of this notable issue (Muthiga, 2004). Organizational culture is defined as beliefs, assumptions, and values that members of a group share about rules of conduct, leadership styles, administrative procedures, ritual, and customs (Manyarkiy, 2006). Further, it has been stated as the shared philosophies, ideologies, values, assumptions, beliefs, expectations, attitudes and norms (Chimanzi & Morgan, 2015). Additionally, the human invention that creates solidarity and meaning and inspires commitment and productivity (Heide, Gronhaug & Johannessen (2012).

Also, a system of shared values and beliefs that interacts with a company’s people, organizational structure, and control systems to produce behavioral norms (Rapert, Velliquette & Garretson, 2002). Organizational culture is to an organization what personality is to the individual - a hidden, yet unifying theme that provides meaning, direction, and mobilization (Brown, 2012). Thompson, Strickland and Gamble (2007) posited that there is consensus on a definition that is all-inclusive. Nonetheless, all definitions are related in terms of the notion that they convey and also brings us close to the required definition of organization culture: a set of shared values and beliefs that tends to unify members of an organization and further consolidate them under the cover of potent norms, behaviors and rules. Cultures can be grouped as either strong or weak. Roth, Schweiger and Morrison (2014), argue that effective companies must have strong cultures. Higgins (2005), suggest that the influence of globalization on an organization’s culture is a reality while referring to Majken Shultz who pointed out that globalization has led to the rise of some organizational culture that carry important weight. It is a challenge to measure the typology of organization culture. Nevertheless, the study notes the Cameron and Quinn model and Competing Values Framework (CVF).

Other typologies of cultures abound, CVF is very comprehensive and has been applied in many empirical studies worldwide. Both Quinn’s CVF model and the Cameron utilize two dimensions to group culture. Taking into consideration the two dimensions, flexibility versus stability and external position versus internal focus Cameron and Quinn came up 24 with a model which defines four types of culture: Hierarchy, market, clan and adhocracy (Hrebiniak, 2016). Cameron and Quinn model shows that hierarchy culture concentrates on sticking to dominant characteristics, internal efficiency and cooperation effectiveness based on Webber’s bureaucracy theory. The clan culture concentrates the issues that are internal with emphasis being on flexibility and not stability. In this culture, teamwork, partnership and corporate commitment to employees are taken to be mail characteristics. Market culture focuses on the organization’s external affairs and it is control oriented. Those organizations that use this culture utilize resistance and observation to attain higher levels of competences and productivity (Hantang, 2005). Adhocracy oriented cultures are dynamic and entrepreneurial, with a focus on risk-taking, innovation, and “doing things first.”

### 2.4.1 Flexibility and Adaptability

Flexible organizations are more probable to up hold change and make a setting that remains open to invention as well as communication (Jung-Chi & Chi-Hung, 2008). This presents an illustration that rightfully receives cultural multiplicity and helps to elucidate strategy implementation. Organizational culture can serve many functions, such as unifying the organization’s members and aids in creation of a set of general standards or rules in an organization that staff should follow (Heide, Grønhaug & Johannessen, 2012).

### 2.4.2 Characteristics of Stability

A stable culture, that methodically supports implementation of strategy, is one that promotes a tradition of partnership, unison, cooperation and collaboration among the staff. This kind of corporate culture augments dedication amongst the staff and concentrates on efficiency in the organization, rather than opposition to set of laws and policies or external factors that forbid achievements (Forman & Argenti, 2015).

### 2.4.3 Goal Unification

Flexible, well-built and integrated cultures advance strategy implementation and influence execution in a constructive manner by supporting the set goals. Goals can become aligned to each other when the cultures of the organization work to concentrate on efficiency and accomplishing the organization’s principal mission (Darminet al., 25 2013). This may comprise of having products being delivered to clients on time, selling out more goods than the chief rivals of the organization. This brings results to the organization, as it makes sure that all jobs done by every person in the organization concentrates on achievement and on the strategic significance of the organization. This enables culture to be in line with implementation of strategy at the most fundamental level. So that this level of amalgamation to work, setting of objectives must be in line with and get support of the systems, rules, practices and procedures within the organization, in so doing helps to attain strategy implementation and enduring the cultural uprightness of the organization (Brenes, Mena & Molina, 2007).

### 2.4.4 Organizational Processes

A fraction of the cultural configuration as well as strategy implementation entails organizational process. The processes may comprise of the utilization of technology to mitigate achievement of goals and the outcome that an organization is in the hunt for when working with clients to meet their wants (Chimhanzi & Morgan, 2015). While mostly the tough predicaments and needs of an organization are fulfilled, the culture turns out to be abandoned in the process. That is now where processes come into consideration and strategy implementation steadily comes into reality of upholding and keeping up with the culture of the organization and strategies (Chimhanzi & Morgan, 2015).

### 2.4.5 Cultural Alignment

Culture is said to align with strategy implementation when an organization is capable of functioning efficiently in the universal market. Culture lets leaders within an organization to work both separately and as a team to develop strategic plans within the organization. These may consist of creating new joint ventures and re-instituting previous ones to go on distributing the finest possible goods and services to a universal market (Akan et al., 2016).

## 2.5 Chapter Summary

This chapter presented a review of literature on factors that affect strategy implementation and formulation. The chapter commenced with an introduction followed by strategy implementation and formulation overview, the influence of organizational structure, organizational capabilities and organizational culture on strategy implementation and formulation.

**3.0 CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

## 3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the research methodology that was used in sampling of respondents, data collection and data analysis. Specifically, this chapter comprises of a research design, population of study, sample size, sampling technique, data collection methods, pretesting research instrument, reliability and validity; and data analysis.

## 3.2 Research Design

Creswell (2014) described a research design as a plan of carrying out a study while controlling the factors that may have interference on the study findings’ validity. In other words, a research design outlines how, where, and when data will be collected and analyzed. This study used a descriptive research design. A descriptive research design describes the attributes of phenomenon or population being studied. Descriptive research is the investigation in which data is collected and analyzed in order to describe the specific phenomenon in its current events, current trends and linkages between different factors at the current time (Saunders & Thornhill, 2009). Descriptive research design was used because it facilitates generalization of the findings to a larger population in business studies. The study used both qualitative and quantitative data. The design is considered appropriate because it also provides an in depth and comprehensive inquiry required to be conducted to have a description of the subject under study namely, factors that affect the successful implementation and formulation of strategy in the county governments in Kenya. The dependent variable in this study is strategy implementation and formulation and the independent variables are organizational structure, organizational capabilities and organizational culture.

## 3.3 Population and Sampling Design

### 3.3.1 Population

Bryman and Bell (2007) explained that a population of study is the totality of the individuals and objects from which a scientifically generalizable inference can be achieved. The target population of this study was 139 who included the county leaders in both arms of the Trans Nzoia County Government, that is, the executive and assembly.

### 3.3.2 Sampling Design

Sampling is the process of selecting a number of individuals for a study in such a way that the individual selected represents the large group from which they were selected (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). A sample size depends on factors such as the number of variables in the study, the type of research design, the method of data analysis and the size of the population. Kothari (2010) suggests that the sample should neither be too large, nor too small. When the population is too large, the researcher needs to select individuals to represent the larger group. The primary purpose of sampling is to obtain information about an entire population by examining only a part of it with the assumption that the sample data convey the population parameters. The sampling design comprises of the sampling frame, sampling technique and sample size

#### 3.3.2.1 Sampling Frame

A sampling frame is the source material or device from which a sample is drawn (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). It is a list of all those within a population who can be sampled, and may include individuals. The sampling frame of this study were the governors, deputy governors, chiefs of staff, county secretaries, county public service board members, county executive committee members, chief officers, directors; speakers of county assembly, assembly clerks and the county assembly service board members.

#### 3.3.2.2 Sampling Technique

This study used proportionate stratified random sampling to select the sample size from the population. This technique is chosen for this study because it attempts to restrict the possible samples to those, which are considered less extreme by ensuring that all parts of the population are represented in the sample in order to increase the efficiency (that is to decrease the error in the estimation, Kothari, 2010). The subgroups, known as strata, together they comprise of the whole population. The strata in this study will be the different cadres of county public officers. From each stratum (cadre) a sample, of prespecified size is drawn independently in different strata. Then the collection of these samples constitutes a stratified sample.

#### 3.3.2.3 Sample Size

The sample size is a subset of the population or the number of items to be selected from the population to constitute a sample (Creswell, 2014). The sample size of this study was the county public officers in Trans Nzoia County Government. Yamane (1967) provided a formula to calculate sample sizes. This formula is used to calculate the sample size and is shown below:

*n= \_\_\_N\_\_\_\_*

1 + N (e) ²

Where n is the sample size, N is the population size and are the level of precision. A 90% confidence level and thus e is 0.1. 139/ (1+139(0.10)2)

**Table 3.1: Sample Size**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Population** | **Calculation** | **Sample Size** |
| 139 | 139/ [1+139 (0.10) 2] | 66 |

In calculating the sample size, distributive stratified sampling was used that adjusted the sample size to 66. Then simple random sampling was used to select the respondents. The sample size distribution is tabulated below

**Table 3.2: Sample Size distribution**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Designation** | **Target Population** |  | **Sample Size** |
| Governor | 1 |  | 1 |
| Deputy Governor | 1 |  | 1 |
| Chief of Staff | 1 |  | 1 |
| County Secretary | 1 |  | 1 |
| County public service board members | 7 |  | 3 |
| County executive committee members | 10 |  | 5 |
| Chief officers | 22 |  | 10 |
| Directors | 88 |  | 38 |
| Speakers of county assembly | 1 |  | 1 |
| Deputy Speaker of county assembly | 1 |  | 1 |
| Assembly clerk | 1 |  | 1 |
| County assembly service board members | 5 |  | 3 |
| **Total** | **139** |  | **66** |

Source: NCG (2018

## 3.4 Data Collection Methods

This study used primary data Primary data according to Kothari (2010) is the data collected a fresh for the first time. Primary data was collected by use of questionnaires. The questionnaire is a fast way of obtaining data as compared to other instruments (Cohen et al., 2003). In addition, Questionnaires give the researcher comprehensive data on a wide range of factors. The questionnaires contain closed-ended questions to encourage higher response rate. The use of questionnaire in this study was appropriate since it is less expensive and less time consuming.

The questionnaire is divided into four subsections. The first sub section is the general information which comprises the gender of the respondents, their age, work experience and their highest level of education. The other three subsections comprised of the three independent variables of the study, which included organizational structure, organizational capabilities and organizational culture. The questionnaire was administered to the targeted 66 county public officers. The questionnaires were self-administered to the sampled public officers who were asked to indicate their response on a five-level Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5 where 1 reflects NA- Not at All, 2 reflects SE- to a Small Extent, 3 reflects ME- to a Moderate Extent, 4 reflects GE- to a Great Extent and 5 reflects VGE- to a Very Great Extent. The questionnaires were emailed to the respondents and in some cases ‘drop n pick method’ was used.

## 3.5 Research Procedure

Permission to conduct this research was granted in stages: initially by the research supervisor and then the Dean, Chandaria School of Business. In compliance with the Science and Technology Act, Cap 250 of the Laws of Kenya, a research permit was obtained from the National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI) (attached in the appendices).

The questionnaire to be used in this study was pre-tested for efficiency to refine the questions before it was administered to the selected sample. A pilot test was conducted to detect weakness in design and instrumentation and to provide proxy data for selection of a probability sample. Pre-testing helps the researcher assesses the efficiency and clarity of the instrument and their uses; the pretest sample should be 1% to 10% depending on the sample size (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2009). For this reason, the researcher conducted pre- 30 test by administering 4 questionnaires to the county public officers who did not form part of the sample. This translates to 5% of the sample size. This was necessary to test the validity of the data collection instrument before doing overall roll out of the questionnaires.

For reliability of the questionnaire to be realized, Cronbach’s Alpha technique was used to administer an internal consistency technique, where alpha values range from 0 to 1, with the reliability increasing as the alpha value increases. The commonly used coefficient in the acceptance of reliability is 0.6 to 0.7, with greater than or equal to 0.8 indicating a good reliability (Kothari, 2010).

The validity of the research instruments was established by seeking opinions of experts in the field of study especially the supervisor and strategic management faculty. Validity of the research instrument simply imply that the conclusions the study derived were valid. This was assured through consultations with the county leaders giving guidelines.

## 3.6 Data Analysis Methods

Data analysis was done after data collection. This is a process used to attach meaning to the data. The type of data analysis tool that used is contingent on the type of data, that is; is the data qualitative or quantitative (Kothari, 2010). The completed questionnaires were edited for completeness and consistency. Code numbers were assigned to each answer of the question to generate a coding list or frame which was then fed into computer software SPSS (V.21.0). Descriptive statistics used include measures of central tendencies (mean), measures of dispersion (standard deviation), frequencies and percentages. Data was then presented in tables, charts and graphs. The data was analyzed to determine the factors affecting strategy implementation in county governments in Kenya, a case of Trans Nzoia City County Government with specific focus on analyzing the relationship between organizational structure and strategy implementation, organizational capabilities and strategy implementation and lastly, organizational culture and strategy implementation. For this purpose, regression analysis was used to illustrate the relationship between the independent variables, which were organizational structure, capabilities and culture and the dependent variable, which was strategy implementation and formulation.

The regression equation used is represented as follows:

Y = β0 + β1X1 + β2X2 + β3X3 +ε

Whereby Y = strategy implementation in the county governments

X1 = Organizational Structure

X2 = Organizational Capabilities

X3 = Organizational Culture

ε = Error Term

β0 regression constant (y-intercept); β1– β3 are the regression coefficients

## 3.7 Chapter Summary

This chapter presented the research methodology that was used in collecting and analyzing data. It contains research design, population, sampling design, data collection methods, research procedures and data analysis methods.
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