FACTORS THAT HINDER STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION IN PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS: A CASE STUDY OF NAKURU MUNICIPALITY

Nixon Kiplagat Mutai

Juma Wakogi

Josphat Kwasira

Strategy

IPRJB
INTERNATIONAL PEER REVIEWED
JOURNAL AND BOOK PUBLISHING

FACTORS THAT HINDER STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION IN PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS: A CASE STUDY OF NAKURU MUNICIPALITY

[1*]Nixon Kiplagat Mutai

[1]Postgraduate Student: Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology

[*]Corresponding Author's Email: skbshadrack@yahoo.com

[2]Juma Wakogi and [3]Josphat Kwasira

Lecturers: Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology

Abstract

Purpose: The purpose of this study was to examine the factors that influence strategy implementation in secondary schools within Nakuru Municipality in Kenya.

Methodology: The study targeted secondary schools within the municipality. A stratified random sampling design was used in the study to select the respondents from school heads/principals, head of departments (HODs) and section heads. The researcher used a questionnaire to collect data. The questionnaire comprised of both open and closed ended question .The sample size was 100 respondents. A pilot study was carried out in schools in Baringo Municipality. Data analysis was done using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 17.The final data was presented using tables. A Governmental permit and a letter of introduction from Jomo Kenyatta University were obtained from each respective institution. Respondent's confidentiality was be maintained during the research undertaking.

Results: The study found that the management has a high positive correlation with a $p<$ than .05 making it a significant variable. The motivation variable was also positive but at lower rate of 40% and significant with a $p<.05$. In conclusion, though the school was affected by external factors, management has got a hand in dealing operational activities within the institution. As a result therefore, school management plays a pivotal role in the entire formulation and implementation plan in the institute and the flow of the processes.

Distinctive contribution to theory, practice and policy contribution: The study recommends that there should be a common basic structure to all secondary schools to reduce contradiction and conflicts from within and without the institution. Further, stakeholders should synergies with the school head in conjunction with the employees within the organization to ensure a successful strategic implementation.

Keywords: *Structure, staff motivation, management style, stakeholder, strategy implementation*

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Organizations are often compelled, internally or externally to examine their strategic position within a given business, marketplace or industry over a specific period of time. A number of theories and models have been developed with the intent to determine, develop and disseminate systematically competitive advantages for the firm (Koch, 2000). The major reason is to strengthen the organization's position in industry and help maintenance of its competitive position in the industry (Ward, 2005).

Formulating a strategy is an intricate task for any management team. Making that strategy to work and implementing it throughout the organization has also proved to be more challenging (Hrebiniak, 2006). It was noted that the best-formulated strategies may fail to produce more performance for the organization if they are not implemented successfully (Noble, 1999). Several surveys have confirmed this view around the world. For example, in a leading magazine in America, The Economist survey; it was reported that   57 percent of firms were not successful at implementing strategic plans over the past three years. The study was based on a survey of 276 senior operating executives in 2004 in the USA, (Allio, 2005). The White Paper of Strategy Implementation of Chinese Corporations in 2006 on the other hand, reported that strategy implementation had become a management challenge affecting all kinds of corporations.

It has been suggested that schools are charged with the responsibility of preparing a student to compete and adapt in the real world since secondary schools are institutions where human resource development is believed to begin (Chapman, Snyder and Burchfield, 1993). It is the role of senior management to ensure that the institution has appropriate strategies to achieve these objectives. Various determinants of successful strategy implementation have been cited. These include: the school structure, staff motivation, management style and the role of various stakeholders related to the secondary school. Successful implementation of secondary school strategies are dependent to a large extent, on favourable school structure, management style that boosts teachers and auxiliary staff motivation and good synergy with related stakeholders.

Subsequently, this synergy can lead to achievement of the goals and objectives of education which includes improved learning outcomes (Master Plan on Education and Training, 1997-2010). On the other hand, argued that secondary school management has become more complex as curricular demands have grown (Thody, Papanaoun, Johansson & Pashiardis, 2007). In addition, parental, government expectations and demand for greater school effectiveness have been raised. Evidently, strategy formulation has become an integral part of running secondary schools. In fact, it was suggested that the role of the principal has become very complex. Principals are compelled to become skilled instructional leaders, change initiators, and managers(Harris, Ballenger & Leonard ,2004). However, not many scholars have studied the relation between management style and successful strategy implementation.

Some scholars have identified motivation as a vital element in strategy implementation. According to these studies, teachers in most African countries work under conditions that are very different from those in developed countries. This phenomenon is mainly due to a considerable increase in student enrolment in primary and secondary leading to dist satisfaction with their job (Osei, 2006 &Salami, 2007).

In Kenya, most institutions both in the private and public sector have implemented organizational strategies. Strategy implementation researches identified five organizational levels. These are: corporate , strategic business unit (SBU) , functional , operational and mixed levels *(*Brenes , Mena & Molina, 2007).A major gap from these researches however, is that, most of the studies that examine the functional level of strategy implementation focused on marketing strategy.The Ministry of Education, Science and Technology in Kenya has been in the forefront encouraging secondary schools to adopt strategic management to creating a globally competitive quality education as envisaged in the sesssional Paper No 1 of 2005. However, empirical data is lacking in the context of sub-Saharan Africa in general and Kenya in on factors that hinder successful strategy implementation. Therefore in an attempt to bridge this gap, the study will investigate the factors that hinder strategy implementation in public secondary schools in Nakuru municipality.

In the recent years, secondary schools in Kenya have adopted a new paradigm of strategic management. This has been due to several reasons such as; competition from private secondary schools, signing of performance contracts among other competitive requirements. Whereas there are a number of strategic plans within the reach of secondary schools' management, consultants have been employed to prepare strategic plans for these secondary schools, thus the challenge lies in the successful implementation of these strategies.

Previous researchers have pointed out that there are a number of challenges that hinder successful implementation of the strategies to position the institution in the competitive environment (Thompson & Strickland, 2003). Some of the reasons attributed to lack of successful implementation of the proposed strategies: lack of management will, management style rigid school structure, inadequate allocation of resources, resistance to change from various stakeholders and employees within the institution (Osei, 2006; Chapmanet *et al.,* 1993; Hrebiniak, 2006). Whereas various scholars have studied these variables in isolation, there is paucity of studies linking strategy implementation and these factors in secondary schools. The researcher therefore seeks to assess factors that hinder the successful   implementation of strategies in selected secondary schools in Kenya, Nakuru Municipality.

1.2 Problem Statement

In the recent years, secondary schools in Kenya have adopted a new paradigm of strategic management. This has been due to several reasons such as; competition from private secondary schools, signing of performance contracts among other competitive requirements. Whereas there are a number of strategic plans within the reach of secondary schools' management, consultants have been employed to prepare strategic plans for these secondary schools, thus the challenge lies in the successful implementation of these strategies.

Previous researchers have pointed out that there are a number of challenges that hinder successful implementation of the strategies to position the institution in the competitive environment (Thompson & Strickland, 2003). Some of the reasons attributed to lack of successful implementation of the proposed strategies: lack of management will, management style rigid school structure, inadequate allocation of resources, resistance to change from various stakeholders and employees within the institution (Osei, 2006; Chapmanet *et al.,* 1993; Hrebiniak, 2006).

Whereas various scholars have studied these variables in isolation, there is paucity of studies linking strategy implementation and these factors in secondary schools. The researcher therefore seeks to assess factors that hinder the successful implementation of strategies in selected secondary schools in Kenya, Nakuru Municipality.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study are to:

i. Determine how the structure secondary schools in Nakuru Municipality influence strategy implementation.
ii. Determine the role of staff motivation on strategy implementation in secondary schools in Nakuru Municipality.
iii. Evaluate the effect of management style on strategy implementation in secondary schools in Nakuru Municipality.
iv. Determine the stakeholder's role on strategy implementation in secondary schools in Nakuru Municipality.

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Review

Strategy was derived from the Greek word *"strategos" which* means "general of the army." From the military context, strategic planning and implementation helped to achieve the vision of the war plan (Guralnic, 1986). In the early 1920s, Harvard Business School developed the Harvard Policy Model.This model defined "strategy" as a pattern of purposes and policies defining the company and its business.

Mintzberg further defined strategy as a pattern in a stream of resource allocations. In limited resource environments such as in the academic research market, a choice of successful strategy implementation model is vital. Strategies lead to improved economic performance (Mintzberg, 1994).It has been further proposed that strategy was about choices and selecting the best strategic fit for an institution (Ansoff ,1988)

The implementation of these strategies, however, is an under-researched area that needs resulting in challenges in strategy implementation. (Yang,Guohui & Eppler, 2008). The study will investigate factors influencing strategy implementation in secondary schools in Nakuru Municipality, Kenya.

2.2 Empirical Review

2.2.1 Secondary School structure's role in Strategy Implementation

Organizational structure have been cited as an important factor in strategy implementation (Heide, Grønhaug & Johannessen, 2002). Management level includes the BoG who's Chairperson is seconded by the Ministry of Education. The head of the institution sits in this board as the secretary. It is at this level that strategy formulation is done in line with the Ministry of Education's goals.

In a related study, it was noted that principals in Kenya were not well trained to deal with challenges and successful strategy implementation (Muthini, 2004). He further proposed that knowledge and problem solving skills were not innate, so principals required in-service training. Evidently therefore, management role, especially the role of the institution is vital to successful strategy implementation and a clear understanding of this interaction is pertinent for the study.

The second level of management consists of the deputy principal and the financial officer or bursar. Whereas they both report to the head of the institution, their roles are in academic and core- curricular activities, respectively. The deputy principal is mandated to ensure academic related matters are well implemented while the school bursar handles the finances as well as coordinate operations among the auxiliary staff within the school.

A proper strategy-structure alignment is necessary for any organization for the successful implementation any strategy. This is especially true in secondary school set up where both teaching and none teaching staff synergize to achieve both academic and none academic success for the school. Sometimes it was necessary to adjust the organizational structure in relation to the strategy to ensure successful strategy implementation (Schaap, 2006).

These studies point out to the gap that exists in understanding how organizational structure affects strategy implementation in secondary schools.

2.2.2 Role of Staff Motivation in Strategy Implementation

It has been proposed that strategy implementation would only be successful if several factors were considered (Qi, 2005). One of these factors includes motivation for all involved staff. According to Guth and MacMillan (1986) an explanation for commitment to a strategy implementation can be inferred from the Expectancy Theory of Motivation.

Low to negative individual school staff commitment to implementing a strategy can be due to perceived inability to implement strategy, low perceived possibility that a strategy will succeed and perception that outcomes will not satisfy the staff's individual goals. It is therefore vital for researchers to study how that staff motivation levels influence the success of strategy implementation within an institution.

2.2.3 Effect of Management Style on Strategy Implementation

Management styles are said to be autocratic, laissez-faire or democratic. Some researchers suggested that a laissez-faire leader turns over almost all authority to group members and does as little leading as possible (Newstrom & Keith,2002). Such a principal will have a hands-off policy on matters pertaining to the school. On the contrary, an autocratic leader maintains most of the authority by issuing orders and telling group members what to do without consulting them .

It has been observed that a democratic leader is one who shares decision-making authority with the members of the school staff. In essence, he can be participatory and consultative therefore allowing opinions and input from teachers and auxiliary staff (Aldag, 2001).   proposed that one of the major obstacles that impede strategy implementation in organization laissez-faire senior management style ;9 of 12 cases of companies studied and an ineffective senior management team ;10 of 12 cases of the companies studied, (Beer & Eisenstat ,2000). It is evident therefore that management style is paramount to strategy implementation.

This finding is especially salient to a secondary school because the main resource here is human and financial resources should be adequately used to ensure good academic performance. It therefore justifies why understanding how management style affects strategy implementation is vital for the study.

2.2.4 Role of Stakeholders in Strategy Implementation

Successful Strategy implementation in an education institution is highly influenced by stakeholders. The stakeholders include the government, parents/guardians, and the community around the school, suppliers, creditors and debtors. A stakeholder has been defined as any individual, group or organization that can place a claim on an organization's resources or output, or is affected by its output (Bryson & Alston ,1996).

In an education institution, the most influential stakeholders are the parents whose children study in the school. The role is to pay school fees and any other financial obligation. The government's role through the Ministry of Education ensures the school is well staffed and also monitors curriculum implementation. The government through the Teacher service Commission is responsible for posting teachers and appointing the head if institution.

Suppliers, deliver both academic and non-academic goods to ensure curriculum implementation is successful. The suppliers can become creditors or debtors depending on their account status at the institution.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

The study targeted secondary schools within the municipality. A stratified random sampling design was used in the study to select the respondents from school heads/principals, head of departments (HODs) and section heads. The researcher used a questionnaire to collect data. The questionnaire comprised of both open and closed ended question .The sample size was 100 respondents. A pilot study was carried out in schools in Baringo Municipality. Data analysis was done using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 17.The final data was presented using tables. A Governmental permit and a letter of introduction from Jomo Kenyatta University were obtained from each respective institution. Respondent's confidentiality was be maintained during the research undertaking.

4.0 RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to report the results of the data analysis. The chapter organized into two sections; the first section provides a description of the demographi characteristics of the sample whole the second section provides the results of the study organized around the research questions.

4.2 The Research Findings

Table 4.2.1 Response Rate Table

Population Strata	F	%
Head Teachers/Principals	11	79
HOD's	35	73
Sections heads	28	74
Total	74	75

The sample of the study is a total of 100 but the response rate for the study is 74 usable responses making a 74% response rate which is deemed satisfactory. This is made up of 11 school heads/Principals, 35 HOD's and 28 sections heads translating to 79%, 73% and 74% response rate for each strata.

Table 4.2.2 General Characteristics

	Characteristics	No.	%
Age			
	20 - 30	5	5
	31 - 40	23	31
	41 - 50	40	55
	Above 51	6	8
	Total	**74**	**100**
Duration in the Institute			
	1 - 3.	17	23
	4 - 6.	40	54
	7 - 9.	13	18
	Over 10 years	4	5
	Total	**74**	**100**
Highest Education level			
	Masters	8	11
	Degree	55	74
	Higher Diploma	6	8
	Diploma	5	7
	Others	0	0
	Total	**74**	**100**

www.iprjb.org

Out of the total respondents 23 of them fall in the age bracket of between 31 – 40 years, 45 respondents are between 41 – 50 years of age and 6 are above 50years of age. 5 were below the age of 30 years. The respondents stay in the institute in the same capacity varied with 17 having stayed in the school for between 1 – 3 years, 40 had stayed for between 4 – 6 years, 13 had stayed for between 7 – 9 years and 4 had stayed for more than 10 years.

The highest education attained by the respondents differed with 8 having masters degree, 55 had degrees, 6 had higher diplomas, 5 had diplomas and non in any other categories not mentioned above.

Table 4.2.3 Secondary School Structure

	Yes	No	Total
Is the secondary school structure applicable to all institutions	14	60	74
Is the structure formulated by the school	51	23	74

Table 4.2.4 Effect of School Structure on Strategy Formulation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not sure	25	34.2	34.2	34.2
	agree	30	39.7	39.7	74
	strongly agree	19	26	26	100
	Total	74	100	100	

The view of the respondents in the school strategy and strategy formulation is that 25 respondents were not sure if the secondary school structure affected strategy formulation, 30 agreed and 19 strongly agreed. This translated to 34% rate, 39% and 26 % rates.

www.iprjb.org

Table 4.2.5 School Structure affects flow of Strategies

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not sure	17	23.3	23.3	23.3
	agree	50	67.1	67.1	90.4
	strongly agree	7	9.6	9.6	100
	Total	74	100	100	

Varied opinion was also formed on the school structure and the strategy implementation flow with 17 respondents not sure if it affects, 50 agreeing and 7 strongly agreeing with the fact. This is a 23% rate for not being sure, 67 strongly ageing and 10% agreeing that do affect the flow of strategy implementation flow.

Table 4.2.6 School Structure is rigid to Strategies

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not sure	45	60.3	60.3	60.3
	agree	24	32.9	32.9	93.2
	strongly agree	5	6.8	6.8	100
	Total	74	100	100	

The rigidity of the school structure was tested in relation to strategy formulation and implementation matters. 45 respondents were not sure if rigidly of the structure affected strategy implementation, 24 agreed and 5 were in strong agreement with the sentiments in relation to the strategy implementation.

Table 4.2.7 School Structure is interfered by External persons

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	disagree	30	39.7	39.7	39.7
	not sure	26	35.6	35.6	75.3
	agree	18	24.7	24.7	100
	Total	74	100	100	

School structure interference is also a factor under consideration. 40% of the respondent's equivalent of 30 respondents disagreed that the school structure can be affected from the external and thus affect the strategy implementation, 26 were neutral and were not sure and 18 agreed which is 25% response rate.

Table 4.2.8 Motivation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	1	1.4	1.4	1.4
	disagree	1	1.4	1.4	2.7
	not sure	7	9.6	9.6	12.3
	agree	42	56.2	56.2	68.5
	strongly agree	23	31.5	31.5	100
	Total	73	100	100	

Varied opinion was registered on the level of staff motivation consideration in strategy implementation. 1 respondent each strongly disagreed and disagreed with the sentiments, 7 were neutral and were not sure 42 agreed with the same and 23 were in strong agreement with the sentiments.

Table 4.2.9 Input of Staff in Strategy Implementation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	disagree	4	5.5	5.5	5.5
	not sure	2	2.7	2.7	8.2
	agree	60	80.8	80.8	89
	strongly agree	8	11	11	100
	Total	73	100	100	

As to the staff input 4 disagreed that there was any level staff input in the strategy implementation programme in secondary schools. 2 were not sure, 60 agreed and 8 strongly agreed with the same.

Table 4.2.10 Personal Motivation affects Strategy Implementation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	disagree	9	12.3	12.3	12.3
	not sure	36	49.3	49.3	61.6
	agree	3	4.1	4.1	65.8
	strongly agree	25	34.2	34.2	100
	Total	73	100	100	

There was different opinion on the personal or individual staff motivation regarding the strategy implementation. A total of 9 respondents disagreed with statement, 36 were not sure, 3 agreeing and 25 strongly agreeing with sentiments.

www.iprjb.org

Table 4.2.11 Communication channels used affect staff motivation to a great extent

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not sure	30	39.7	39.7	39.7
	agree	37	50.7	50.7	90.4
	strongly agree	7	9.6	9.6	100
	Total	73	100	100	

The communication channels as a motivation aspect was also opined on with 30 respondents not sure if communications channel was a hindrance to strategy implementation, 37 agreeing with the same and 7 strongly agreeing

Table 4.2.12 Management Style

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	disagree	18	24.7	24.7	24.7
	not sure	7	9.6	9.6	34.2
	agree	17	23.3	23.3	57.5
	strongly agree	32	42.5	42.5	100
	Total	74	100	100	

The shared vision of the management was also a factor considered as hindering the implementation of strategies in secondary schools. 25% of the respondents translating to 18 respondents disagreed with the matter, 10% that is 7 respondents not sure, 17 agreeing and a 42% that is 32 respondents strongly agreeing with the same.

www.iprjb.org

Table 4.2.13 School Environment

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not sure	17	23.3	23.3	23.3
	agree	38	50.7	50.7	74
	strongly agree	19	26	26	100
	Total	74	100	100	

The school's environment where strategies are being implemented was considered to determine the extent of affect. 17 of the total respondents were neutral and were not sure if the school environment was indeed a hindrance to implementation of strategy, 38 agreed and 19 strongly disagreed.

Table 4.2.13 Management Style influence implementation of strategy

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	disagree	18	24.7	24.7	24.7
	not sure	19	26	26	50.7
	agree	30	42.5	42.5	93.2
	strongly agree	5	6.8	6.8	100
	Total	74	100	100	

The general management style in the secondary school set up was a factor considered for opinion in the strategy implementation. It was found out that 18 respondents disagreed with the fact, 10 were not sure, 30 agreed and 5 strongly disagreed.

Table 4.2.14 Management Style affects Strategy Intent

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	agree	36	49.3	49.3	49.3
	strongly agree	37	50.7	50.7	100
	Total	73	100	100	

The Strategic intent of management that in the last intention to the whole strategy process is another factor that the respondents gave their opinion on. 36 agreed that the intent is a factor that hinders strategy implementation, while 38 strongly disagreed on the same.

Table 4.2.15 Correlations

		overall strategy implementation rating	stakeholders influence	school structure	management structure	motivation
overall strategy implementation rating	Pearson Correlation	1	0.088	.266*	-.610**	-.398**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.461	0.023	0	0
	N	73	73	73	73	73
stakeholders influence	Pearson Correlation	0.088	1	-0.19	-.401**	-.310**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.461		0.107	0	0.008
	N	73	73	73	73	73
school structure	Pearson Correlation	.266*	-0.19	1	.505**	.395**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.023	0.107		0	0.001
	N	73	73	73	73	73
management style	Pearson Correlation	.610**	-.401**	.505**	1	.687**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.023	0	0		0
	N	73	73	73	73	73
motivation	Pearson Correlation	.398**	-.310**	.395**	.687**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.012	0.008	0.001	0	
	N	73	73	73	73	73

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

From the findings there is low positive correlation between the school structure and the strategy implementation of 26% which significant, the $p < 0.05$. The relationship between the

stakeholders and the implementation of strategy very low at approximately 9% with a p>0.05. From the findings there is low positive correlation between the school structure and the

strategy implementation of 26% which significant, the p < 0.05. The relationship between the stakeholders and the implementation of strategy was very low at approximately 9% with a p>0.05. The management has a high positive correlation of 61 % and the p< than .05 making it a significant variable. The motivation variable is also positive but at lower rate of 40% and significant with a p<.05.

4.3 Discussion

4.3.1 General

The age of the respondent varies with few below 30 and above 50 years, this shows that people at the management level in secondary schools are young in age. The majority lies in the age bracket of 41 -50 meaning that most people rise to the management level with age and leave their employment just before the age of 50 years. From the finding it can be seen that most of the management staff have not stayed for a very long time in their respective stations, this means that there might be transfers affecting the movement in the secondary schools. Most respondents have high educational level which might be a factor in the strategy formulation and implementation.

4.3.2 School Structure

The response indicates that the school structure is an internal affair and is formulated by the school; this means that management has control over it. Given this means that the structure is an important component of the flow of the implementation of strategies in the institutions. Being there little interference in the matter any problem in the implementation is a factor that which is within the management discretion to deal with although it does have a impact on the whole strategy.

4.3.2 Motivation

For any strategy to successful the participation of all internal persons and especially the management must be included. From the finding it can be seen that staff at all levels are always considered in formulation and implementation thus might reduce the resistance level at any stage. Communication is the main problem in secondary schools as the management might be having the right mechanism and forum this would in turn hinder the implementation rate of the strategies.

4.3.3 Management style

The way the management handle the management of school on individual basis or on the general environment is factor in the implementation of strategies. This is echoed by the response on the shared vision shared by the management in relation to the strategy implementation process where the shared vision was a major indicator thus there should be a strong culture to be adopted by any other people joining the management team.

The environment is another strong indicator which influences the strategy implementation. Intent would be end result and the intention for such strategies formulated whether to affect an

individual in the entire institution. The major matter of consideration should be the goal congruence of the organization and not the individual's gain on the strategies formulated and implemented.

The variables under study have all positive relationship to the dependent variable but with a varying degree. The most significant being the management style and the employees motivation. More emphasis should be put in the variable and to change and build on it so as to have an impact on the implementation of strategies in secondary schools.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Conclusion

The person responsible for implementing the strategies in the school and to some extent the length of service of the member of staff tasked with the responsibility of implementing the strategy would also influence the level of success of the strategy. Therefore in analyzing the individual in the office that formulates strategies, the research established that the Board of Governors and Principal played a key role in ensuring the strategies were implemented successfully within the school.

Although heads of departments and section heads had a role in strategy implementation, the principal or school head teacher played a pivotal role in ensuring successful strategy implementation. Participation of both teaching and auxiliary staff was vital in ensuring that all levels of the institution were involved in the implementation of the strategy. Further to this, the research also established that once the strategies have been formulated by the senior staff it was communicated to all staff members through forums, annual general meetings, memos and workshops. Furthermore in the Municipality most schools have a shared value /vision which vision help to achieve the strategic intents and a clear management structure.

The school structure influenced the implementation of strategies in that cooperation between the top management and all members of staff ensured each person contributed the success of the strategy and support from main stakeholders such as parents and the students ensured the benchmarks were attained.In most schools in Nakuru the most influential factors to implementation of strategies were staff motivation, stakeholders and management style. It was also established that principals in schools within Nakuru municipality have been in office longer than one year and most of them have been involved in implementation of strategies in their schools.

5.2 Recommendations

There should be a common basic structure to all secondary schools of which if adopted will give a good guidelines that will have contradiction and reduce the conflicts and personal interference from within and without. These should be cable of being checked on periodic basis and t for a basis of performance contracting to the management team in the institutions.

Though the management is not the employers of the persons within the institutions, there should mechanisms where there is full involvement of the staff within the institute to participate in the entire process of strategy formulation and implementation on short time basis. Within them there

should be adhoc committees that are responsible in the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of various strategies and recommendations done and follow ups made.

Exchange programmes for the institutional heads on a periodic basis should be made to enable the management team share their sentiments and exchange of ideas and on various issues especially on strategy matters.

Since the education sector affects different stakeholders, there should involvement and inclusion of different stakeholders in the strategies processes especially the implementation process since it where good materials always loose out. These should be part of the stake committee in the implementation in conjunction to the employees within the organization.

REFERENCES

Akan, O., Allen, R., Helms, M., & Spralls Ш, S. (2006).Critical Tactics for   Implementing Porter' s Generic Strategies. *The Journal of Business Strategy, 27, 43-53.*

Aldag, (2001). Organizational Behavior and Management. An Integrated Skills Approach. USA. Southwestern.

Brenes, E., Mena, M. & Molina, G. (2007). Key success factors for strategy implementation in Latin America. *Journal of Business Research*, 1-9.

Bryson, J.& Alston, F. (1996), Creating and Implementing Your Strategic Plan: A Workbook for Public and Non-Profit Organizations .San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hantang Qi. (2005).Strategy Implementation: The Impact of Demographic Characteristics on the Level of support received by middle managers. *Management International Review.*

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

Harris, S., Ballenger, J., & Leonard, J. (2004). Aspiring Principals Perceptions: are mentor principals modeling standards-based leadership? *Mentoring and Tutoring*, 12(2), 155-172.

Higgins, J. (2005). The Eight S's of Successful Strategy Execution. *Journal of Change Management.*

Hrebiniak, L. (2006).Obstacles to Effective Strategy Implementation. Organizational Dynamics.

Grant R. (2002). Contemporary Strategy Analysis: Concepts, Techniques, Applications, 4th ed.,Blackwell.

Johnson G. & Scholes K. (2002). Exploring Corporate Strategy, 6th ed., Prentice-Hall.

Kelley, C. & Peterson, K.. (2007). The Work of Principals and their Preparation: addressing critical needs for the twenty-first century. The Jossey-Bass Reader on   Educational leadership (2nd ed.), pp. 351-401.

Lehner, J. (2004). Strategy Implementation Tactics as Response to Organizational, Strategic and   Environmental Imperatives. *Management Review*. 15, 460-480.

Ministry of Education, Science and Technology website. Information on KESI was retrieved on 21st January 2007 from http://www.education.go.ke/KESI_Basics.htm**.**

Ministry of   Education Science and Technology (2004). Sessional Paper No. 1 of 2005. A Policy Framework for Education, Training and Research: meeting challenges of education,training and research in Kenya in the 21st cen

Muthini, P. (2004). A study of Headteachers' Perception towards in-service Programmes in Public Secondary Schools in Nairobi Province. Unpublished Masters of Education Thesis. University of Nairobi.

Noble, C. & Mokwa, M. (1999). Implementing Marketing Strategies: Developing and   Testing a Managerial Theory. *Journal of Marketing*. 63, 57-73.

Olson, E., Slater, S..&   Hult, G.T. (2005).The importance of structure and process to strategy implementation. Business Horizons. 48, 47-54.

Osei, G. (2006). Teachers in Ghana, issues of training, remuneration and effectiveness. *International Journal of Educational Development*. Vol. 26, 38 - 51.

Porter, M. (2004). Competitive Strategy. Harvard Business Review, New York.

 Rivani E. (2005). Porter's Five Forces Model: an Academic exercise or a tool for Practitioners, Undergraduate Dissertation in English. European School of Economics, Milan, Italy.

Schaap, J. (2006).Toward Strategy Implementation Success: An Empirical Study of the Role of Senior-Level Leaders in the Nevada Gaming Industry. *UNLV Gaming Research & Rview Journal*, 10, 13-37.

Schmidt, S. & Brauer, M. (2006). Strategic Governance: How to assess Board   Effectiveness in Guiding Strategy Execution. *Strategic Governance,* 14, 13-22.

Thody, A., Papanaoun, Z., Johansson, O. & Pashiardis, P. (2007). School Principal Preparation in Europe: *International Journal of Educational Management, 21(1), 37 53.*

Viseras, E., Baines, T. & Sweeney, M. (2005). Key Success Factors when Implementing Strategic Manufacturing Initiatives. *International Journal of Operations &Production Management, 25, 151-179*

White, C. (2001). Strategic Management. New York Press. Palgrave, McMillan.