

## Organizational Factors that influence Implementation of Strategic Plans in Private Secondary Schools in Nairobi

Nyagemi Abel<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Winnie Njeru<sup>2</sup>, Dr. Jesse Maina Kinyua<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Business and Economics, University of Embu, Kenya

<sup>2</sup>Lecturer, School of Business, University of Nairobi, Kenya

<sup>3</sup>Lecturer, School of Business and Economics, University of Embu, Kenya

### \*Corresponding Author:

Dr. Winnie Njeru

Email: [wininjeru@gmail.com](mailto:wininjeru@gmail.com)

**Abstract:** The study sought to establish organizational factors influencing implementation of strategic plans in private secondary schools Nairobi. Specifically, the study aimed at determining the effects of top management commitment, coordination of activities, employee skills and responsibilities and organization culture on implementation of strategic plans. A descriptive cross sectional study was used. The study population was 101 private secondary schools. A random sample of 50 private secondary schools was considered. A structured questionnaire was administered. Data was analyzed using inferential and descriptive statistics such as frequencies; percentages and graphs. Exploratory factor analysis was used in determining the influencing factors. The study established the following group of organizational factors as having an influence on implementation of strategic plans in private secondary schools in Nairobi: resource constraints (human and financial), overlapping activities, interference from the local government, work pressure, conflict of interest, poor attitude, overlapping plans and tight timeframes. The conceptual model was tested and found to be having a statistically significant relationship among the implementation of strategic plans, top management commitment, coordination of activities, employee skills and responsibilities and organization culture. The study recommends a further study on the specific factors should be done in particular sub-counties to explicate on how those factors affect implementation of strategic management plans in private schools in other counties in Kenya.

**Keywords:** Strategy, Strategic Plan, Stakeholders, Organizational Culture, Management, Implementation, Culture, Communication.

### INTRODUCTION

Strategy implementation has attracted less attention in strategic and organizational research than strategy formulation or strategic planning. Alexander [1] 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 on strategy implementation. Most organizations appear to have difficulties in implementing their Strategic Plans. Strategic planning is important in determining the success of an organization in getting to its desired end using the available resources [2].

Due to globalization, many organizations today are focusing on becoming more competitive by launching competitive strategies that give them an edge over others. To do this, they need to craft workable strategies. In Kenya, the demand for high quality services continues to grow as citizens' expectations about the quality and value of those services rise.

Perhaps it is in view of this that most Kenyans are now going for more private services than ever before. Policy makers and stakeholders in the education sector are also increasingly under pressure to provide more, customized and better quality services. Since the year 2003, the Kenyan Education Sector has embarked on plans to institute Education reforms at all levels.

In the highly competitive environment of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, organizations must be able to effectively change through the application of effective strategies, quickly and in a way that the competitors will be unable to imitate [3]. Numerous studies have been conducted globally in the area of strategy formulation but less attention has been given to the implementation process. The researcher found relatively few studies conducted on strategy implementation with most of them focused on the public sector. In Kenya, many organizations are able to generate innovative strategic plans, but few are able to successfully implement these plans.

Strategy implementation involves organization of the firm's resources and motivation of the staff to

achieve objectives. The environmental conditions facing many firms have changed rapidly. Today's global competitive environment is complex, dynamic, and largely unpredictable. To deal with this unprecedented level of change, a lot of thinking has gone into strategy formulation. It is obvious that the biggest challenge for organizations today is not formulation but rather strategy implementation [4]. Historically, numerous researchers in strategic management gave great significance to the strategic formulation process and considered strategy implementation as a mere by-product or invariable consequence of planning [5]. Fortunately, insights in this area have been made recently which temper our knowledge of developing strategy with the reality of executing that which is crafted [6]. Strategy implementation is both a multifaceted and complex organizational process, it is only by taking a broad view that a wide span of potentially valuable insights is generated.

Private secondary schools are registered as businesses under the Companies Act of Kenya, 2015. Private secondary schools operate in education industry where competition takes place to offer similar services. It is therefore imperative for private secondary schools to understand their resources and the forces that shape industry competition. The objective of the study was to establish the factors influencing the implementation of strategic Plans in private secondary schools in Kenya.

Strategy execution is not limited to Private Secondary Schools. However, the study was restricted in scope to cover only private secondary schools in Nairobi. The study was done in schools which had strategic plans. The respondents for the study was the top management, Heads of Departments, teachers and support staff both who were involved in strategy execution at various levels. The scope of this study was also limited to the execution of an existing strategy. This means that this study did not go into more detail on the formation of the strategy that was being executed. In addition, strategy execution can be studied from different viewpoints. The two basic viewpoints were: seeing strategy implementation as a straightforward operationalization of a previously formulated strategy and focus on the interpersonal and behavioral aspects related to strategy execution.

Strategy implementation is a connecting ring between formulation and control. Herbiniak [7] argued that while strategy formulation is hard, making strategy work and executing it is even harder. Similarly, Cater and Pucko [8] concluded that while 80% of organizations have the right strategies, only 14% have managed to implement them well. Echoing previous studies with similar results, Zaribaf and Bayrami [9] found that most executives in organizations spend a great deal of time, energy, and money in formulating a

strategy, but do not provide sufficient input to implement it properly.

Previous studies have emphasized the importance of formulating and implementing a strategy, with higher importance given to strategy formulation due to its criticality to the existence and expansion of the organization [10]. While strategy formulation is usually a function of top management, its implementation is the responsibility of middle and lower level managers. However, the role of top management is vital in preparing a workable strategy and communicating it clearly so that middle managers can more easily implement it. A successful implementation journey starts in the formulation stage and a failure to find that link between strategy formulation and strategy implementation is a step toward strategy failure. Strategy formulation is basically entrepreneurial in nature and requires a great deal of analysis, judgment, and innovation. However, implementation requires administrative and managerial talent and an ability to foresee obstacles that might arise in strategy implementation.

The emergence of corporate planning in the 1970s further heightened disconnect between the formulation and implementation, as operating decisions were made as if plans did not exist. Key insight was that plans were ineffective and line managers needed to be involved in the process [11]. The development of analytical tools like Boston Consulting Group (BCG), Personal information managers (PIMS) further reinforced the notion that strategy was an exclusive top management function. The development of the strategic management paradigm delineated the formulation and implementation components of strategy, identified roles for all managers except the lowest operating level in the formulation process. Implementation was design of standards, measures, incentives, rewards, penalties, and controls [13]. Managers were thought to be more as obstacles. It was Mintzberg and Waters [12] whose view that strategy is a pattern in a stream of decisions, that expanded the role of other than the top management in strategy making since strategies could be emergent. Burgelman [14] integrated both the top down and bottom up view of strategy by introducing the concept of autonomous development of strategy in addition to the normal intended strategy, reinforcing the observations of Bower [15] who stated that the top management had little control on what projects get pushed for approval.

Despite these studies; till the 1990's strategy formulation and implementation were seen as separate items, with a distinct focus on strategizing (achieving the fit between the environment and the plan) while effective implementation of it was taken as granted. Content research dominated. The works of Mintzberg

[12], Miller & Frieson [16] and Pettigrew [17] brought into focus the gaps between formulation and implementation. This brought into prominence the research stream concentrating on study of change. This also challenged the paradigm of explicit formulation and implementation, as strategies could now be emergent, unrealized. It also strengthened the tiny but growing band of process researchers who were looking at the role of power, culture as shapers of strategy outcomes. Research on strategy implementation, though neglected, was taken by few researchers in form of development of frameworks [18-21] and in the form of evaluation of individual factors affecting the implementation process like- the interests of middle managers [22] or the usage of implementation tactics (Nutt 1987).

The present context for strategic management has been described as hypercompetitive [23] which ensures that sustained advantage is transitory. Literature on implementation of strategy can be categorized as a stream of literature where the predominant focus has been on content such as literature on diversification, innovation, mergers and acquisitions and collaborative strategies and their link to performance, stream which deals with organisational structure as proxy for implementation variables, literature on strategic consensus and role of middle level managers, stream which has attempted to develop frameworks for implementation of strategy and the resource allocation process literature.

The success of every institution depends on the quality and commitment of its human resources to implement laid strategies [24]. However, in the recent past, research indicates that the performance of the Kenyan Secondary schools in national examinations has been deteriorating [25]. This state of affairs resulted largely from systems of management in schools which put emphasis on compliance with processes rather than results. Private secondary schools in Kenya are faced with numerous challenges especially increasing competition from public schools and unfavorable government policies on form one selection and abolition of KCSE performance ranking. Research has shown that strategic planning is one of the major steps that schools can take to address the challenges they face in enhancing the quality of their programmes in provision of Education (Bell, 2002).

One of the problems for school managers is implementation of strategic plans. This is supported by recent research studies indicating that most big organisations have had problems in implementing their strategies and in many occasions have failed in service delivery [27]. While a number research studies on strategy implementation have been carried in various organizations [26], limited studies have been

undertaken to determine the factors which influence implementation of strategic management plans in private secondary schools.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study adopted a descriptive cross sectional survey design in examining the factors that affect implementation of strategic plans in private secondary schools in Nairobi. The focus of the study was the Directors, Principals or Deputies, Head of Departments, Teachers and support staff in 101 private secondary schools of Nairobi County. The accessible population was made up of 50 private secondary schools, a sample of 30% of the target population. Mugenda and Mugenda [28], considers a sample size of 30% as sufficient enough, this study therefore, made use of 49.5% of the population size and thus targeted 119 respondents as the sample size.

Simple probability was used and out of 101 private secondary schools in Nairobi, 50 schools was randomly selected. According to Mugenda and Mugenda [28], in stratified random sampling the subjects are selected in such a way that the existing sub-groups in the population are more or less reproduced in the sample. Primary data was collected using a structured questionnaire. Secondary data was collected from published materials.

A sample size of 119 respondents was targeted. 86 respondents completed and returned the questionnaires resulting in a response rate of 73.3%. According to Mugenda and Mugenda [28], a response rate of 50% is adequate for analysis and reporting and therefore the response rate was adequate for further data analysis.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The results showed that most private schools' strategies were exceling academically with a mean of 2.07 of respondents and a standard deviation of .54. As to whether student enrolment was excellent, majority of the respondent were uncertain with a mean of 2.38 and a standard deviation of 1.12. Whether there was individualized student attention in their school, the mean was 2.18 with a standard deviation of 1.09; there was a wide range of responses ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Most respondents were uncertain that their schools' community involvement was excellent; mean 2.65 and a standard deviation of 1.11. The respondents were asked whether the goals and objectives of the implementation process clearly defined the activities that would be undertaken; the mean for this question was 2.2875 with a standard deviation of .86 implying that in majority of the institutions sampled, the objectives were clearly defined to facilitate the undertaking of the implementation activities, implementation processes were measurable.

The study results revealed that the goals and objectives were achievable, there was a multifaceted response with a mean of 2.40 and a standard deviation of 1.03. Whether a time-frame was set for the achievement of the goals and objectives, most respondent were uncertain; mean 2.18 with a standard deviation of 1.04. Most respondents were of the opinion that the goals and objectives set could be realized within the project time frame; mean 2.30 with a small standard deviation of only 0.82. As to whether the implementation was completed within the set budget, majority of the respondents were uncertain; mean 3.17 and a standard deviation of 2.605. Most respondents were uncertain that the goals and objectives that were set could be achieved within the budget; mean 3.17 and a standard deviation of 1.16. Additionally schools also employed parental and community involvement to some

extent; mean equals 2.22, with a standard deviation 1.26 indicating homogeneity of responses made by the respondent. These findings corroborate with Hallahan [29] who argued that the nature of organizational communication by an organization to fulfill its mission. Therefore, the strategic communication frameworks should be laid out to aim the objectives of communicating to the audience/organization.

The researcher sought to assess how various aspects of coordination activities affected strategy implementation in private secondary schools in Nairobi County. Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which listed aspects of coordination of activities affected strategy implementation in a scale of 1-5 where 1 was 'strongly agree' and 5 was to a 'strongly disagree'. These findings are shown in table 1.

**Table 1: Coordination of Activities**

Coordination of Activities	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
1. There are strategic control systems which provides a mechanism for keeping daily actions in congruence with tomorrow's goals	80	2.64	1.08
2. the school often experiences duplication and delay in service delivery	76	2.96	1.06
3. Implementation is taking more time than originally expected	76	2.94	1.05
4. There are distractions from competing activities	76	2.63	1.04
5. Some employees are opposed to strategy implementation	76	2.75	1.16

Source: Primary Data, 2017

The respondents, to a moderate extent, agreed that there are strategic control systems which provided mechanism for keeping daily actions in congruence with tomorrow's goals (M=2.64, SD=1.08), the school often experiences duplication and delay in service delivery (M=2.96, SD=1.06), implementation is taking more time than originally expected (M=2.95, SD=1.06), there are distractions from competing activities (M=2.63, SD=1.04) and some employees are opposed to strategy implementation (M=2.75, SD=1.16).

in the UK and found that due to lack of coordination, implementation took more time that originally intended. Beer and Eisenstat's [31] advised, silent killers of strategy implementation comprise unclear strategic intentions and conflicting priorities and weak coordination across functions

The researcher sought to establish the different aspects of top management commitment to the implementation of strategic plan. Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed with a number of statements. The pertinent results are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2: Top Management Commitment**

Top Management Commitment	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
1. Top managers demonstrate willingness to give energy and loyalty to the implementation process	80	1.95	.90
2. Middle managers play a pivotal role in strategic communication	76	2.16	.65
3. The goals and objectives of the implementation were communicated to all stakeholders.	80	2.00	.93
4. Senior executives involve lower-level managers the strategy formulation and its implementation	79	2.91	4.77
5. Senior executives have not spared any effort to persuade the employees of their ideas	80	2.70	1.27

Source: Primary Data, 2017

The results in Table 2 reveal that to a great extent, top managers demonstrate willingness to give energy and loyalty to the implementation process (M=1.95, SD=.90), middle managers play a pivotal role in strategic communication (M=2.16, SD=.65) and the goals and objectives of the implementation were communicated to all stakeholders. (M=2.00, SD=.93). To a moderate extent, senior executives involve lower-level managers in strategy formulation and implementation (M=2.91, SD=4.77). Senior executives have not spared any effort to persuade the employees of

their ideas (M=2.70, SD=1.27) Table 2 Shows the findings.

Respondents were asked to rate the extent they agreed with specific elements of employee skills and responsibilities that affected strategy implementation. They were to do so in a scale of 1-5 where “1” was ‘Strongly agree’ and “5” was to a ‘strongly disagree’. onality profile of the key players in the different organizational departments (M=2.3, SD=.90). The results are summarized in table 3.

**Table 3: Employee skills and responsibilities**

Employee skills and responsibilities	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
1. There are enough resources to participate in Strategy Implementation	76	2.45	1.06
2. Employee skills and responsibilities in the strategy implementation process are clear	76	2.55	.94
3. Peoples’ considerations have been integrated into strategy implementation	79	2.42	.98
4. Employee personality differences has influences strategy implementation	82	2.80	1.06
5. There is a fit between the intended strategy and the specific personality profile of the key players in the different organizational departments	86	2.33	.90

Source: Primary Data, 2017

The respondents indicated that to a moderate extent, there were enough human resources to participate in Strategy Implementation (M=2.45, SD=.1.06), Employee skills and responsibilities in the strategy implementation process are clear (M=2.55, SD=.94), Peoples’ considerations have been integrated into strategy implementation (M=2.42, SD=.98), to a great extent, Employee personality differences had influences strategy implementation (M=2.80, SD=1.06) and that there was a fit between the intended strategy and the specific plans.

These results are agreement with those of Lorange [32] which support an opinion that human resources are the key success factor in strategy implementation. Lorange [32] related past strategy implementation failures to the fact that the human factor was conspicuously absent from strategic planning. The

above findings also agree with the findings in a study conducted by (Rapa and Kauffman, 2005) they asserted that in order to avoid power struggles between departments and within hierarchies, one should create a plan with clear assignments of responsibilities regarding detailed implementation activities.

The respondents were asked to describe whether their organization culture was conducive or not conducive in relation to implementation of their strategic plans. The specific study questions that this project sought to answer was “what kind of culture best described the working conditions in the target Private Secondary school in relation to implementation strategic plans?” There were two choices for the perceived conditions including “conductive”, “not conducive”.

**Table 4: Opinion of Respondent on organizational culture**

Prevalent Culture	Frequencies	Percentage
Conductive	63	75.9%
Not Conductive	20	25.1%
<b>Total</b>	83	100%

Source: Primary Data, 2017

The results in Table 4 indicate the most common positive condition was “conductive” with 75.9 % of respondent supporting it while “conductive” condition that had 25.1%. The conducive condition favours strategy implementation but the low score for not conducive condition means that implementation

cannot be well achieved. This study demonstrates what scholars like Drucker (1985), Aosa (1992) and Letting (2009) concluded by observing that culture requires a conducive and effective environment that is supportive of the employees involvement in implementation. Waweru (2008), Amulyoto (2004), Johnson and

Scholes [33] and Amabile et al. (1996) also demonstrated the need to have a conducive environment for a successful implementation of strategic plans. The study corresponds well with what the scholars mentioned and is therefore fit for further inferences on implementation of strategic plans.

This study sought to establish the respondents' opinion on whether management activities regarding their organization culture supported implementation of

strategic management plans and the responses were tabulated and analyzed using percentages. The results from table 5 are supportive of what other scholars including Robinson and Pearce [34], Sackman (2003), Amulyoto (2004), Aosa (1992) and Awino (2007) have cited. The scholars indicated that organizations have their own culture and individuals could find it supportive or not supportive. It is therefore right to use the study findings for making further inferences on the effect of culture on effective strategy implementation.

**Table 5: Respondent's opinion on management activities on organization culture**

Suggested Reason	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Existence or non-existence of appropriate change environment	60-Existent	72.3%	72.3%
	23- Non-Existent	27.7%	100%
Existence or non-existence of shared policies and work procedures	45-Existent	54.2%	54.2%
	38- Non-Existent	45.8%	100%
Community participation or non-participation	43- Participation	51.8%	51.8%
	40- Non-Participation	48.2%	100%
Existence or non-existence of rewards for motivation	45-Existent	54.2%	54.2%
	38- Non-Existent	45.8%	100%
Religious background	50- Clear	60.2%	60.2%
	33- Not clear	39.8%	100%
Existence or non-existence of good communication and leadership	40- Existent	48.2%	48.2%
	43-Non-Existent	51.8%	100%

Source: Primary data (2017)

The researcher sought to establish whether organization culture had an effect on implementation of strategic plans. Questions that corresponded to this objective were "Why do you think your organization culture supports achievement of strategic objectives?" and "In what areas do you think your organization culture does not support achievement of strategic objectives?" Majority of the responses stated various themes on norms and values of the organization and how they affected communication channels, reward systems, diversity and creativity in strategy implementation.

A few respondents indicated that their organization culture advocated for various groups' welfare formations which required members to participate in some routine activities which sometimes conflicted with core organizational activities. Examples mentioned included "baby showers", funerals and charity work. The study established that dominant characteristics do influence strategy implementation in private secondary schools in Nairobi County. Pearce [35], states that the underlying pressure that results from dominant characteristics is a discrimination and fairness culture whose goal is that everyone should assimilate and reflect the dominant culture. While the intentions of those who promote such a culture might be good, employees may feel that they are not being encouraged

to bring their cultural assets to the workplace thus resulting to non inclusive organizations.

Behaviour norms were also mentioned by respondents to have an effect on strategy implementation. Kotter [36] describes behaviour patterns as the more visible level of organization culture. Conventional practices do exist in the institutions and they do influence the behaviour of both leaders and employees of the institution. Norms have a relatively great impact on individual and are potentially indicative of environments that support organization learning and knowledge management Kotter [36]. Norms have a more direct impact on the day to day activities and work situation of organizational members than work values. The findings of this study indicated that organization culture had an influence on strategy implementation of a Private Secondary School. However, the difference lay in the influence that each component of culture has. Dominant characteristics do have an effect on the values upheld by the institution and on the financial strategy. The formal norms present in these institutions do drive the pursuit of goals and objectives clearly and directly. On the other hand, the informal norms present in the institution do determine the behaviour of both employees and leaders of the institution.

Multiple regression analysis was used to measure the influence of coordination of activities, organization culture, employee skills and

responsibilities and top management commitment and implementation of strategic plans in private secondary schools. Table 6 presents the pertinent results.

**Table 6: Multiple Regression Model Summary**

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
.868 <sup>a</sup>	.753	.721	.0909809	2.001

Source: Primary Data

a. Predictors: (Constant), Top Management, Coordination of Activities, Employee Skills and Responsibilities, and Organization Culture.

b. Dependent Variable: Implementation of Strategic Plans

Table 6 presents a correlation coefficient of 0.868 and determination coefficients of 0.753. This depicts a strong relationship between implementation of strategic plans and the independent variables. Thus, top management, coordination of activities, employee skills and responsibilities, and organization culture account

for 75.3% of the variations in implementation of strategic plans.

Analysis of Variance was used to test the significance of relation that exists between variables; thus, model's significance. The results are presented in Table 7.

**Table 7: Analysis of Variance**

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	.238	7	.034	615.760	.000
Residual	.002	10	.000		
Total	.240	17			

Source: Primary Data

a. Dependent Variable: Implementation of Strategic Plans

b. Predictors: (Constant), Top Management, Coordination of Activities, Employee Skills and Responsibilities, and Organization Culture.

The results in Table 7 revealed that the regression model has a margin of error of  $p < .001$ . This

indicates that the model has a probability of less than 0.1 thus, it is statistically significant.

**Table 8: Regression coefficients**

Factors	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
Constant	.039	.061		3.512	.013
Implementation of Strategic plans	.708	.000	.034	5.428	.003
Top Management Commitment	.853	.031	0.024	.635	.528
Coordination of activities	.791	.000	.020	2.797	.024
Employee skills and responsibilities	.763	.005	.044	3.425	.013
Organization Culture	.711	.001	.034	42.865	.000

Source: Primary Data, 2017

1 component extracted.

Dependent Variable: Implementation of Strategic Plans

The study results revealed that Implementation of Strategic Plans =  $0.039 + 0.708 * \text{Strategy} + 0.853 * \text{Top management} + 0.791 * \text{coordination of activities} + 0.763 * \text{Employee skills and responsibilities} + 0.711 * \text{organizational culture} + e$ . Applying this equation, the study found that holding strategy, Organization Culture, Coordination of activities, Employee skills and responsibilities, Top Management Commitment at zero Implementation of Strategic management plans is

calculated at 0.039. In addition, the study established that holding strategy, Organization Culture, Coordination of activities and Employee skills and responsibilities, a unit increase in implementation of strategic plans would lead to a 0.853 increase in implementation of strategic plans. However, when Organization Culture, Employee skills and responsibilities and Top Management Commitment are constant, a unit increase in system would lead to a 0.791

increase in implementation of strategic plans. The study thus concluded that Top management Commitment had the highest level of impact on enhancing implementation of strategic plans in private secondary schools in Nairobi County, Kenya while Organizational Culture had the

The study further found that there were various internal (micro-environmental) and external (macro environmental) factors that influenced strategy implementation in private secondary schools in Nairobi county. Other than the influential effects from the internal stake-holding, the outside partners and systems had a significant role in determining the schools' strategy implementation agenda. The results agree with Kurendi [37] asserts that strategy implementation is not only an internal exercise but an involvement of all stakeholders. The findings are additionally complemented by various past studies. Mburu [38] identified the factors influencing implementation of strategic plans as stakeholder involvement, regulatory environment, availability and utilization of resources, strategy coordination, internal work systems, and alignment with external environment. Ochanda (2006) studied on challenges of strategy implementation at Kenya Industrial Estates and found out that organizational structure, leadership, organizational culture, reward structure and organizational policies are critical factors that have to be considered for effective implementation of strategies. In a similar study, Koske (2003) focused on strategy implementation and its challenges at Telkom Kenya Limited and found out that organizational structure, corporate culture and top management commitment supported the implementation of strategies.

According to the study findings, the implementation of strategic plans is still inadequate due to common reasons such as resource constraints (e.g. human and financial), overlapping activities, interference from the local government, work pressure, conflict of interest, poor attitude and tight timeframes. While there was uncertainty as to whether the implementation was completed within the set budget and planned timeline, the research found out that the respondents' view on the effect of top management commitment towards strategy implementation included drawing of action plans, motivating the employees in implementation process, recruiting adequate suitably qualified human resources to assist in strategy execution, rewarding strategic objective achievers and educating employee on achievement of implementation.

## CONCLUSION

From the findings the study recommends putting in place timely and adequate employee training programs to enhance skills, the private schools' Directors to ensure there are sufficient resources to

implement the strategic plans and School Management to carry out employee sensitization throughout the implementation process. The study was carried out in order to establish the organizational factors affecting implementation of strategic management plans in Private Secondary Schools in Nairobi County. The study recommends a further study on the specific factors should be done in particular sub-counties to explicate on how those factors affect implementation of strategic management plans in private Schools in other counties in the country.

## REFERENCES

1. Alexander L. Successfully implementing strategic decisions', *Long Range Planning*. 2005; 21 (3): 91-97.
2. Feltham C. *Failure*. London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis, 2014.
3. Kumar D, Gašperšič G, Pleško M, Huhmann R, Krepp S. Implementation of the distributed alarm system for the particle accelerator fair using an actor concurrent programming model and the concept of an agent, 2015. (PCaPAC2014, 99-101)
4. Blahovaa, Michaela, Knápková, Adriana. *Effective Strategic Action: From Formulation to Implementation*. International Association of Computer Science and Information Technology (IACSIT), 2011.
5. Wind Y, Robertson TS. Marketing strategy: new directions for theory and research, *Journal of Marketing*. 2003; 47:12-25.
6. Olson EM, Slater SF, Hult GTM. The importance of structure and process to strategy implementation, *Business Horizons*. 2005; 48: 47-54.
7. Hrebiniak LG. Obstacles to Effective Strategy Implementation. *Organizational Dynamics*. 2006; 35(1) : 12-31.
8. Cater T, Pucko D. Factors of effective strategy implementation: Empirical evidence from Slovenian business practice. *Journal for East European Management Studies*. 2010; 15(3) : 207-236.
9. Zaribaf M., Baryami. Pricing Challenges in Global Marketing: A Model for Export Pricing. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 2010.
10. Ashkenas R, Francis S. Integration managers: Special leaders for special times. *Harvard Business Review*. 2000; 78 (6) : 108 -116.
11. Floyd S, Wooldridge B. *Building strategy from the middle*. Sage, 2000.
12. Mintzberg H. Patterns in Strategy Formation. *Management Science*. 1978; 24(9) : 934-948.
13. Floyd SW, Wooldridge B. Middle management's strategic influence and organizational performance. *Journal of Management Studies*. 1997; 34 (3): 465-485.
14. Burgelman RA. A Model of the Interaction of Strategic Behavior, Corporate Context, and the



- Concept of Strategy. *Academy of Management Review*. 1983; 8(1) : 61-70.
15. Bower DH, Bower RS. Test of a Stock Valuation Model. *The Journal of Finance*. 1970; 25(2) : 483.
  16. Miller T. Hierarchical Operations and Supply Chain Planning. Mintzberg, H. Leadership and management development: An afterword. *Academy of Management Executive*. 2004; 18(3) : 140-142.
  17. Pettigrew AM, Thomas H, Whittington R. *Handbook of strategy and management*. London: Sage Publications, 2002.
  18. Hrebiniak LG, Joyce WF. Organizational Adaptation: Strategic Choice and Environmental Determinism. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 2005; 30(3) : 336.
  19. Brodwin DR, Bourgeois LJ. Five Steps to Strategic Action. *California Management Review*. 1984; 26(3) : 176-190.
  20. Skivington JE, Daft RL. A Study of Organizational 'Framework' and 'Process' Modalities For The Implementation of Business-Level Strategic Decisions\*. *J Management Studies*. 1991; 28(1), 45-68.
  21. Okumus F. A framework to implement strategies in organizations. *Management Decision*. 2003; 41(9) : 871-882. Okumus F, Roper A. A review of disparate approaches to strategy implementation in hospitality firms. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*. 1999; 23(1) : 20-38.
  22. Guth WD, Macmillan IC. Strategy implementation versus middle management self-interest. *Strat. Mgmt. J*. 1986; 7(4) : 313-327.
  23. D'Aveni RA, Gunther RE. *Hypercompetition: Managing the dynamics of strategic maneuvering*. New York: The Free Press, 1994.
  24. Nyaoga RB, Magutu PO, Aduba J. Is there a Link between Supply Chain Strategies and Firm Performance? Evidence from Large-Scale Manufacturing Firms in Kenya. *Journal of Operations and Supply Chain Management*. 2015; 8(2) : 1.
  25. Yara PO, Wanjohi WC. Performance Determinants of Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education (KCSE) in Mathematics of Secondary Schools in Nyamaiya Division, Kenya. *Asian Social Science*. 2011;7(2) :107-112.
  26. Kimani SW, Kagira EK, Wawire CM. Strategic Marketing Applications within the MSE Sector in Kenya. *IJBA*. 2010; 1(1).
  27. Mutuku S, Mutuku M. Strategic Planning in the Higher Education sector of Kenya: Case study of Public Universities in Kenya: A Conference Paper Presented at the 1st KIM Conference on Management: A Journal of the KIM School of Management, 2009. ISSN 2070-4730.
  28. Mugenda OM, Mugenda AG. *Research methods: Qualitative and Quantitative approach*, Nairobi: Africa Centre for Technology Studies (ACTS) Press, 2003.
  29. Hallahan K, Holtzhausen D, Van Ruler B, Veri D, Sriramesh K. Defining Strategic Communication. *International Journal of Strategic Communication*. 2007;1 (1) : 3-35.
  30. Al-Ghamdi SM. Obstacles to successful implementation of strategic decisions: the British experience', *European Business Review*. 2008 2008 (6) : 322-327. 8876302085
  31. Beer M, Eisenstat RA. The Silent Killers of Strategy Implementation and Learning. *Sloan Management Review*. 2010; 41 (4):29-40
  32. Lorange P, &Roos J. *Strategic alliances: Formation, implementation and evolution*. Cambridge, Mass. [u.a]: Blackwell, 1998.
  33. Johnson G, Scholes K, Whittington R. *Exploring Corporate Strategy*. 8th ed. London: Prentice Hall, 2008.
  34. Robinson B, Hurley I, Scholes CP, Lerman L. Internal Twisting of Short DNA Segments. *Stereodynamics of Molecular Systems*. 1979; 283-295.
  35. Pearce JA, Robinson RB. *Formulation, implementation, and control of competitive strategy*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill/Irwin, 2003.
  36. Kotter JP. *Corporate culture and performance*. Place of publication not identified: Free Press, 2014.
  37. Kurendi GA. *Factors Influencing Strategy Implementation Among Flower Firms in Naivasha, Kenya (Unpublished MBA Project)*. School of Business, University of Nairobi, Kenya, 2013.
  38. Mburu SM. *Factors influencing strategy implementation at the LVSWSB in Kenya, (Unpublished MBA Project)*. University of Nairobi, Kenya, 2013.