STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION AND PERFORMANCE OF KENYA REVENUE AUTHORITY

James Ombui Obiero
Master in Business Administration (Strategic Management), Kenyatta University, Kenya

Phelgona Genga
Department of Business Administration, Kenyatta University, Kenya

International Academic Journal of Human Resource and Business Administration (IAJHRBA) | ISSN 2518-2374

Received: 17th September 2018

Accepted: 22nd September 2018

Full Length Research

Available Online at:

http://www.iajournals.org/articles/iajhrba_v3_i3_15_30.pdf

Citation: Obiero, J. O. & Genga, P. (2018). Strategy implementation and performance of Kenya Revenue Authority. *International Academic Journal of Human Resource and Business Administration, 3*(3), 15-30

ABSTRACT

Organizations are indeed open systems and have to respond to their environment through appropriate strategies. The study sought to find out the major influence that concept of strategy implementation has on the performance of Kenya Revenue Authority. The objectives of the study were to establish effect of strategy resource allocation, performance targets, strategy communication and strategy supervision on performance of Kenya Revenue Authority. The study was based on Resource based view theory and Mckensy's 7s theory of strategy implementation. The study used descriptive research design and a population of 150 respondents was considered. Quantitative data collected was analyzed by the use of descriptive statistics using SPSS (Version 22) and presented through percentages, means, standard deviations and frequencies. In addition, the study conducted a multiple regression analysis to estimate the model for the study. The analyzed data was presented in graphs, frequencies, charts and tables for interpretation and to enable draw conclusions and recommendations thereof. The study had a coefficient of correlation R of 0.869 an indication of strong of correlation between the variables and a coefficient of adjusted R2 was 0.749. The study found out that resource allocation, performance target strategy communication and strategy supervision significantly influenced firm performance of KRA. The study concludes that KRA employees performs their tasks accurately, KRA have information systems to improve the way employees performs their duties, KRA allocates sufficient funds to implement its strategies and have experienced employees in strategy implementation. Performance targets are set with outputs in mind and in terms of revenue collection. Performance targets focus on change in revenue collection and are set in line with customer satisfaction. Clear strategy communication had improved KRA performance, support from senior management had promoted realization of targets at KRA and regular departmental evaluations promotes organizational performance at KRA. Senior management provides a strong support fit for strategy implementation, senior management are directly involved in strategy implementation and have direct influence on strategy implementation. The study recommends that KRA ought to allocate sufficient funds to implement its strategies and have experienced employees in strategy implementation. Performance targets ought to focus on change in revenue collection and set in line with customer satisfaction. Regular departmental meetings at KRA ought to be held to share the targets for each employee, senior managers ought to be responsible for ensuring set targets are met and strategies formulated at KRA ought to be clearly communicated across all affected departments and senior management ought to support the implementation of strategies at KRA. Regular departmental updates ought to provide room for timely corrective action and managers ought to train their subordinates on how well to deliver on set strategy targets.

Key Words: *strategy implementation, performance, Kenya Revenue Authority*

INTRODUCTION

Strategic ideas have no value unless they are implemented and strategy implementation is the most important element of the strategy management process. Thompson and Strickland (2012) observe that successful strategy implementation depends upon the skills of working through others, organizing, and motivating. Implementation practices play a major role in controlling and monitoring of strategy by gauging performance against plan, frequently reviewing strategy into action and building an organization culture which should be aligned to the strategy. It is also important to identify appropriate resources and competences to support strategy, in addition allocate resources appropriately and control performance (Johnson and Scholes, 2007). Therefore, the organization needs trained and motivated managers, responsive systems and structure to ensure organization optimal performance (Macmillan & Tampoe, 2010).

Strategic management comprises various theories that support efficient and effective strategy implementation practices in the modern business today, which is confronted with unique challenges caused by rapidly changing environment and diversity (Haynes and Murkhjee, 2001). Profit maximizing and competition theory is the driver of any organization as it ensures competitive advantage but to ensure sustainable competitive advantage organizations should focus on human resources management which leads to resource based theory.

Successful strategy implementation requires the input and cooperation of all players in the company. Implementation of strategies requires linkage in two dimensions both vertical and horizontal. To ensure successful strategy implementation, it is also important to maintain strategic control of critical environmental factors affecting the viability of strategic plan and assess the effects of strategic actions to ensure the strategic plan achieves its goal (Zhao, 2015).

Strategy Implementation

Strategy implementation is important but difficult because implementation activities take a longer time frame than formulation, involves more people and greater task complexity, and has a need for sequential and simultaneous thinking on part of implementation managers' (Hrebiniak & Joyce, 2011). In view of these factors, research into strategy implementation is also difficult for it entails the need to look at it over time; presents conceptual and methodological challenges as it involves multiple variables which interact with each other and show reciprocal causality (Fajourn, 2010).

The development of the now in vogue strategy process research can be traced to Europe, where attention was drawn to the role of power as an influence on strategy outcomes (Pettigrew 2003). The role of culture was probed and later the combined effects of culture and power were studied (Pettigrew, 2011). A series of large scale empirical studies (Pettigrew and whipp 2011, Pettigrew et al., 2012) developed a process approach which combined the content, process, context of change with longitudinal data collected at multiple levels of analysis, thereby introducing the element of time into the study and allowing for multiple levels of analysis but integrated. Thus, process research has opened up the firm's internal processes for study, and given an impetus to the role of time and dynamics in addressing issues of strategic choice and change. Strategy implementation is an action phase of the strategic management process as stated by (Heracleous, 2010).

Strategy implementation has been increasingly the focus of many numerous studies, particularly because the process from strategy formulation to strategy implementation is not effective and therefore not adequate in today's business environment (Cited in Sorooshian et al. 2010). Implementing strategy is putting the chosen strategy into practice, resourcing the strategy, configuring the organization's culture and structure to fit the strategy and managing change (Campbell et al., 2012).

Organisational Performance

Performance is a measure of an organization's financial condition or financial outcomes resulting from management decisions and carried out by organization members. The size of performance reflects the strategic decisions, operational and financing (Fening, 2012). The analogy, finance is the heart of corporate, business strategy planning must be balanced by financial planning strategy. Any decision or business opportunity that taken should be adjusted according to calculations, weather it really profitable company or not. Significant information in financial statements can be used to assess performance during a specific time (Camisón & Villar- López, 2010). It was concluded that performance is part of financial statements which indicates the position of resource companies during the period, and financial statements describing financial company performance's ability to generate revenue from its available resources.

Kenya Revenue Authority

Kenya Revenue Authority (KRA) is a state corporation established by an act of Parliament of July 1st, 1995 Cap 469 as a central body. The authority is charged with the responsibility of collecting revenue on behalf of the government of Kenya. The authority is under the general supervision of the Minister of Finance (Treasury). The Authority's mandate and core business is to assess, account, administrate, and enforce all the laws relating to revenue. KRA's role is assessment, collection, administration and enforcement of laws relating to revenue; restoring economic independence be it elimination of budget deficits and creating organization structures that maximize revenue collection.

KRA has faced several challenges, both external and internal factors, ranging from political, technological, legal and social. These include, among others, the ever-widening informal sector and technological advancement, which have led to increased cases of tax avoidance and evasion. Other challenges are related to economic integration and regional trading blocs; the HIV/AIDS pandemic have also contributed to erosion of the tax base. In addition, Departments were operating autonomously and lacked managerial cohesiveness and personal approach to customer needs. Income Tax and Vat were under the Ministry of Finance while the road transport department (RTD) was under the Ministry of Roads.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Corporate organizations are faced with the challenges of implementation. Wooldridge and Floyd, (2010), emphasized that the strategy implementation could be more difficult than thinking up a good strategy. According to Mintzberg (2007), a strategy has little effect on an organization's performance until it is implemented. An unimplemented strategic plan kept in a cabinet is a great source of employee negativity (Healthfield, 2008). For successful implementation of strategic plans, organizations need to effectively handle the key sets of relationships that generally do affect the successful implementations (Horton, 2006). Kenya Revenue Authority has comparative and competitive advantage in skill drive service supply on account of her strategic location and relatively well-developed human resource base, and being the only major government agent of revenue collection. The growth and development of the authority has however been hampered with challenges some of which include Government policies and regulations, restricting market access in areas of interest to KRA, treatments that give priority to nationals in service delivery. Less developed basic ICT infrastructure, low internet penetration and inadequate expertise in ICT and global financial crisis from other countries are some of the challenges that are faced by KRA in the globalized world. Previous research on strategic planning has tackled various organizations other than public sector. For instance, Mehdi Zaribaf (2010), carried out a study on an Effective factors pattern affecting implementation of strategic plans. Sharbani (2001), carried out a study on strategic planning practices within hotels and restaurants in Nairobi. Sagwa (2002), studied the pharmaceutical manufacturing firms, Wanjohi (2002), covered the insurance firms in Kenya, Bett (2003), studied the tea manufacturing companies in Kenya while Busolo, (2003), covered the motor vehicle franchise holders in Nairobi. There exists a knowledge gap in emergent economies for instance Kenya where there is limited both theoretical and empirical review about strategy implementation and its influence on performance of public institutions. This study therefore sought to fill the knowledge gap by investigating the effect of strategy implementation on performance of Kenya Revenue Authority.

GENERAL OBJECTIVE

The main objective of the study was to establish the influence of strategy implementation on performance of Kenya Revenue Authority.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

1. To establish the effect of strategy resource allocation on performance of Kenya Revenue Authority.

2. To analyze the effect of performance targets on performance of Kenya Revenue Authority.
3. To assess the influence of strategy communication on performance of Kenya Revenue Authority.
4. To analyze the effect of strategy supervision on performance of Kenya Revenue Authority.

THEORETICAL REVIEW

Resource Based Theory

This theory was proposed by Barney 1991 and asserts that sustainable competitive advantage is attained when the firm has a human resource pool that cannot be imitated or substituted by its rivals. Investment in training and development is a means of attracting and retaining people and the returns expected are performance improvement, productivity, innovation that results to increased levels of knowledge and competence. David (2013) states that the human element of strategic implementation plays a key role in successful implementation and involves both managers and employees of the organization and these can be achieved through regular department meetings.

Schultz (2001) argues that both knowledge and skill are a form of capital whose concept implies investment in people through education and training which leads to increased productivity in a positive rate of return leading to growth in organization, increased profits, high remuneration and low staff exits. Shane (2003) concurs and reiterates that human resource is one of the key parameters in organization performance. Highly educated managers utilize their knowledge and when they combine this with their social contacts manage to acquire appropriate human resources required to create a highly performing firm.

Mckinsey's 7S Theory

The McKinsey 7S theory is a management tool that was developed by Robert and Peters (1984). The 7s model is an assessment and monitoring tool an organization can use with significant relevance to strategy implementation. It is a holistic framework that continually analyses and improves the effectiveness of an organization, Tomas, Robert and Julien (2011). The seven fundamental elements referred to as 7S of this framework comprises of skills, structure, systems, strategy, shared values, style and staff. These elements can be categorized as the soft elements such as skills, staff, shared values and style while the hard elements are strategy, structure and systems.

The framework is a vital tool in strategy implementation since a firm with the right skill set and staff numbers, shared values aligned properly with the good structure, strategy and operational or monitoring systems can operationalize its' implementation objectives well. Thus, a firm's management looks to which degree a firm has these elements that it can count on as internal strengths and plan for future strategic changes. According to (Arthur, et al.2010), lack of shared values and systems is a liability which makes a firm vulnerably weak during strategy implementation. Shared values are central to all the elements, they represent the company's culture, vision, beliefs that define the organizations future orientation and what it stands for. The hard elements are easier to change while the soft elements are much harder to change since they consist of humanistic elements, corporate culture, values, beliefs and competencies acquired over time. All the elements are mutually reinforcing and a change in one affects the functions of the others.

EMPIRICAL REVIEW

Resource Allocation and Organizational Performance

According to (Okumus, 2013) resource allocation ensures provision of time, financial, human and knowledge resources vital for strategy implementation. (Sterling, 2003) notes that chronic lack of resources, capital and capacity hinders effective strategy implementation. Effectiveness of strategy implementation is least in part affected by the quality of people involved in the process, (Govinda, 1989). Quality in this case refers to the skills, attitudes, experience, capabilities and other characteristics of people required for a specific task or position" (Peng and Litteljohn, 2001).

The practice emphasizes on implementing strategic performance management systems and integrating human resources system. Successful strategy implementation depends greatly on good internal Organization of resources which ensures internal organization structures that are responsive to the needs of strategy, and competent personnel through building and nurturing skills and selecting people for key positions. Pearce and Robinson (2010) agrees on the importance of having a robust guideline on resource allocation and states that they in addition need guidance on what to do through short term objectives which are measurable and outcome achievable in one year. In addition, should develop smart goals examining areas of product performance, competitive performance, and quality improvement, performance of business processes, customer satisfaction, customer loyalty and retention.

Performance Targets and Organizational Performance

Performance targets focus on the outputs of an organization such as product quality, revenues or profits. These targets are called key performance indicators (KPI'S). This practice is used as a response to high levels of change such as rapid growth or reorganization of business which is managed output measured through set targets based on performance indicators (P.I) and these are usually accompanied by incentives and rewards that relates to achievement of the set targets. This approach mainly applies to balanced scorecard which combines both qualitative and quantitative measures mainly financial, customer, internal and innovation. Kaplan and Norton

(2012) introduced the balanced scorecard and uses strategic and financial measures to assess the outcome of a chosen strategy.

The fourth strategy perspectives that need to appear on every scorecard, are financial perspective which translates mission into action and clarifies what is wanted. Customer perspective looks at customer-oriented strategy which involves market share data, while customer perspective looks at the retention and satisfaction of customers and internal perspective measures internal performance in relation to productivity and innovation and learning perspective (Johnson & Scholes, 1997). According to Haynes and Mukherjee (2001), devising effective reward and incentives system and linking it to performance outcomes all based on strategic performance targets is key. Defining jobs and assignments in terms of what is to be accomplished makes work environment result- oriented and performance is key supported by a corporate culture that promotes good strategy execution process. Ansoff (2010) concurs and states that rewards and incentives whether based on historical performance, growth and initiative are key.

Communication and Strategy Implementation

Miniace and Falter (2006), state that communication is the key success factor in strategy implementation. A comprehensive communication plan is vital for the effective roll-out of implementation programs. Communicating strategy means exchanging information regarding a change in systems, processes and behavior in the firm. Communication should be open between top management and lower levels of the firm to inculcate trust, sharing of knowledge and guide decision making process in strategy implementation.

According to (Alexander, 2005) successful implementation and execution requires top management to clearly communicate what a new strategic decision is about to all stakeholders and operational personnel. (Rappert and Wren, 2010) findings in a survey suggest that organizations with open supportive communication environment tend to out-perform organizations with restricted communication environment (cited in Rapert, Velliquete and Garretson, 2012). Communication is conducted through written, formal and informal means and pervades throughout the organizational structure and context of implementation programs.

Strategy Supervision and Organizational Performance

This practice involves direct control of strategic decisions by one or a few individuals. Often the practice is found in family businesses and small medium Enterprises (Sme's) and requires that the manager understands what the job they are supervising entails. According to Ansoff et al, (1990) this approach requires involvement of all managers who would be responsible for implementation as well as of managers and other individuals who make key contributions to the decision-making process. Before implementation, education and training are given to the participants in the relevant concepts, skills and techniques. This is achieved by ensuring there is strategy clarification whereby people understand the strategy in order to embrace it and help support its implementation. Communication is crucial as it ensures commitment and cascading strategy wraps it all in ensuring successful implementation of strategy (David, 2003).

The Company's managers must put into account controls that provide strategic control and the ability to adjust strategies, commitments and objectives in response to the ever-changing future conditions (Pearce and Robinson, 2007). Managers leading the strategy process through shaping values, cultures and keeping the organization responsive by initiating corrective actions to improve strategy execution. The stronger the strategy supportive fit are, the greater the chances of successful strategy implementation (Thompson & Strickland, 2009).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The research study applied the descriptive research design in the process of determining the findings in relation to the relationship between strategy implementation practices and performance of Public institutions in Kenya. According to Cooper and Schindler (2006), a descriptive study was concerned with finding out the what, where and how of a phenomenon.

Target Population

According to Ngechu (2004), a population is a well-defined or set of people, services, elements, events, group of things or households that are being investigated. In this study, the target population was composed of the 150 management staffs employed at Kenya Revenue Authority in Nairobi who were the most conversant with information sought. The study used census since the population was less than 200.

Data Collection Instrument and Procedure

The study used a questionnaire administered to each member of the sample population. The questionnaire had closed-ended questions. The closed-ended questions provided more structured responses to facilitate tangible recommendations. The closed ended questions were used to test the rating of various attributes and this helped in reducing the number of related responses in order to obtain more varied responses. The questionnaires were administered using drop and pick later method. The questionnaire were carefully designed and tested with a few members of the population for further improvements.

Data Analysis and Presentation

Data collected was purely quantitative and it was analyzed by descriptive statistics. The descriptive statistical tools such as Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS Version 23.0) and MS Excel helped the researcher to describe the data and determine the extent used. The findings were presented using tables and charts. The Likert scales was used to analyze the mean score and standard deviation, this helped in investigating the relationship between strategy implementation practices and performance of Public institutions in Kenya. Data analysis used frequencies, percentages, means and other central tendencies. In addition, the researcher carried out a multiple regression analysis so as to determine the relationship between the dependent and independent. The regression equation (**$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + \beta_3X_3 + \beta_4X_4 + \varepsilon$**)

Where: Y = Performance of Kenya Revenue Authority; X_1 = Strategy Resource allocation; X_2 = Performance targets; X_3 = Strategy communication; X_4 = Strategy supervision; $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4$ = Regression Coefficients; ε = Error term

RESEARCH RESULTS

The main purpose of the study was to establish the influence of strategy implementation on performance of Kenya Revenue Authority. The study was guided by the following research questions; What is the effect of strategy resource allocation on performance of Kenya Revenue Authority? To what extent does performance targets affect performance of Kenya Revenue Authority? How does strategy communication affect performance of Kenya Revenue Authority? What is the effect of Strategy supervision on the performance of Kenya Revenue Authority?

The study adopted descriptive research design to determine the findings in relation to the relationship between strategy implementation practices and performance of Public institutions in Kenya. The target population was composed of 150 management staffs employed at Kenya Revenue Authority in Nairobi who were the most conversant with information sought. The study relied on primary data that was collected by use of structured questionnaires. The study had a coefficient of correlation of 0.869 an indication of strong correlation between the variables. The coefficient of adjusted determination was 0.749.

The first specific objective was to establish the effect resource allocation on performance of Kenya Revenue Authority. The study established that resource allocation positively and significantly influenced firm performance of Kenya Revenue Authority. This shows that both the variables move hand in hand with one another, that is a positive adoption of resource allocation in KRA influences firm performance. This shows that KRA had embraced allocation of experienced employees in strategy implementation.

The second specific objective was to analyze the effect of performance targets on performance of Kenya Revenue Authority. The study found out that performance target significantly influenced performance of KRA. This show that Kenya Revenue Authority performance targets were set line with internal innovations and efficiency. KRA performance targets were set in terms of revenue collection and with outputs in mind.

The third specific objective was to assess the influence of strategy communication on performance of Kenya Revenue Authority. The study pointed out that strategy communication positively influenced performance of KRA. This show that that both variables move in tandem.

The study points out that strategies formulated in KRA were clearly communicated across all affected departments, senior management supported the implementation of strategies and were responsible for ensuring set targets were met.

The last specific objective was to analyze the effect of strategy supervision on performance of Kenya Revenue Authority. The study established that strategy supervision significantly influenced firm performance of KRA. This shows that that the two variables move consecutively. The established that managers trained their subordinates on how well to deliver on set strategy targets and cultivated a culture that promoted strategy implementation in KRA.

INFERENTIAL STATISTICS

A multiple linear regression model was used to establish the influence of strategy implementation on performance of Kenya Revenue Authority. The findings of coefficient of correlation and coefficient of determination are as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Model summary

Model	R	R square	Adjusted r square	Std. Error of the estimate
1	.869[a]	.756	.749	1.75088

a. Predictors: (constant), Strategy Supervision, Resource Allocation, Strategic Communication, Performance Target

The study shows that coefficient of correlation R of 0.869 an indication of strong of correlation between the variables. Coefficient of adjusted R2 was 0.749 which translates to 74.9%. This show that changes in dependent variable can be explained by independent variables (strategy supervision, resource allocation, strategic communication, performance target). The residual of 25.1% can be explained by other variables beyond the scope of the current study.

An ANOVA was conducted as 95% level of significance. The findings of F Calculated and F Critical are as shown in Table 2.

Table 2: ANOVA

Model	Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Regression	388.160	4	97.04	31.650	.000[b]
Residual	334.150	109	3.066		
Total	513.439	113			

a. Dependent variable: performance
b. Predictors: (constant), supervision, resource allocation, communication, performance target

The study established that the study had $F_{\text{Calculated}}$ of 31.650 and F_{Critical} was 2.4549, this show that of $F_{\text{Calculated}} > F_{\text{Critical}}$ an indication that the overall regression model was significant for the study. The p value was 0.00<0.05 an indication that at least one independent variable significantly influenced the financial performance at KRA.

In order to establish the individual influence of variables on financial performance, regression coefficient was used. The findings are indicated in Table 3.

Table 3: Regression Coefficient

	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients		
Model	**B**	**Std. Error**	**Beta**	**T**	**Sig.**
(constant)	7.111	2.181		3.260	.001
Resource allocation	.235	.066	.405	3.562	.001
Performance target	.245	.056	.155	4.383	.009
Strategic Communication	.169	.047	.396	3.565	.001
Strategic Supervision	.290	.062	.392	4.679	.000

a. Dependent variable: Firm Performance

$$\mathbf{Y = 7.111 + 0.235X_1 + 0.245X_2 + 0.165X_3 + 0.290X_4}$$

Where: Y = Performance of Kenya Revenue Authority; X_1 = Strategy Resource allocation; X_2 = Performance targets; X_3 = Strategy communication; X_4 = Strategy supervision

The findings in Table 3 established that holding all variables constant, firm performance would be at 7.111. A unit increase in resource allocation while holding other variables constant, firm performance would be at 0.235. A unit increase in performance target while holding other factors constant, financial performance would be at 0.245. A unit increase in strategic communication while holding other factors constant, financial performance would be at 0.169. A unit increase in strategic supervision while holding other factors constant, financial performance would be at 0.290.

The study established that resource allocation had a p value of 0.001<0.05 an indication that the variables significantly influenced performance of KRA. This is supported by Okumus (2013) who stated that resource allocation ensures provision of time, financial, human and knowledge resources vital for strategy implementation.

The p value of performance target was 0.009<0.05 an indication that the variable significantly influenced firm performance of KRA. This is in support with Haynes and Mukherjee (2001) who states that performance is key supported by a corporate culture that promotes good strategy execution process.

The study pointed out that strategic communication had a p value of 0.001<0.05 an indication that the variable significantly influenced firm performance of KRA. This is supported by Alexander (2005) who states that a successful implementation and execution requires top management to clearly communicate what a new strategic decision is about to all stakeholders and operational personnel.

The p value of strategic supervision had a p value of $0.00<0.05$ an indication that the variable significantly influenced firm performance of KRA. This agrees with Thompson and Strickland (2009) who stated that the stronger the strategy supportive fit are, the greater the chances of successful strategy implementation (Thompson & Strickland, 2009).

CONCLUSIONS

The study concludes that KRA employees performs their tasks accurately, KRA have information systems to improve the way employees performs their duties, KRA allocates sufficient funds to implement its strategies and have experienced employees in strategy implementation. KRA have well trained employees working in each department, KRA's each department is well staffed in line with the employees' work, KRA have engaged enough staff in each department and has well experienced employees in tasks performed by the department.

The study concludes that performance targets at KRA are set in line with internal efficiency and innovations, internal learning projections and performance targets focus on quality of services delivered to customers. Performance targets are set with outputs in mind and in terms of revenue collection. Performance targets focus on change in revenue collection and are set in line with customer satisfaction.

The study concludes that formulated strategies at KRA are well communicated to all employees in the organization. Clear strategy communication had improved KRA performance, support from senior management had promoted realization of targets at KRA and regular departmental evaluations promotes organizational performance at KRA. Senior management supports the implementation of strategies at KRA and ownership of strategy had promoted organizational performance. Regular departmental meetings at KRA are held to share the targets for each employee and senior managers are responsible for ensuring set targets are met. Strategies formulated at KRA are clearly communicated across all affected departments.

The study further concludes that KRA embraces adequate controls, managers shapes the values in their subordinates to achieve organizational goals and cultivates a culture that promotes strategy implementation in KRA. Senior management provides a strong support fit for strategy implementation, senior management are directly involved in strategy implementation and have direct influence on strategy implementation. Senior managers get daily updates on the performance on each section, regular departmental updates provide room for timely corrective action and managers train their subordinates on how well to deliver on set strategy targets.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The study recommends that KRA ought to allocate sufficient funds to implement its strategies and have experienced employees in strategy implementation. KRA employees ought to perform their tasks accurately and KRA ought to have information systems to improve the way employees performs their duties. KRA ought to engage enough staff in each department and have well experienced employees in tasks performed by the department. KRA ought to have well trained employees working in each department. KRA's each department ought to be well staffed in line with the employees' work.

The study recommends that performance targets at KRA ought to be set in line with internal efficiency, innovations and internal learning projections. Performance targets ought to focus on change in revenue collection and set in line with customer satisfaction. Performance targets ought to be set with outputs in mind and in terms of revenue collection. Performance targets ought to focus on quality of services delivered to customers.

The study recommends that formulated strategies at KRA ought to be well communicated to all employees in the organization. Regular departmental meetings at KRA ought to be held to share the targets for each employee, senior managers ought to be responsible for ensuring set targets are met and strategies formulated at KRA ought to be clearly communicated across all affected departments, senior management ought to support the implementation of strategies at KRA, senior management ownership of strategy ought to promote organizational performance and clear strategy communication ought to improve KRA performance. Senior management ought to promote realization of targets at KRA and regular departmental evaluations ought to promote organizational performance at KRA.

The study recommends that KRA ought to embrace adequate controls, managers ought to shape the values in their subordinates to achieve organizational goals and cultivate a culture that promotes strategy implementation. Regular departmental updates ought to provide room for timely corrective action and managers ought to train their subordinates on how well to deliver on set strategy targets. Senior management ought to provide a strong support fit for strategy implementation, senior management ought to be directly involved in strategy implementation and have a direct influence on strategy implementation. Senior managers ought to get daily updates on the performance on each section.

REFERENCES

Aaltonen, P & Ikavalko, H. (2002). *Implementing Strategies Successfully.* MCB UP Limited

Alexander, L.D. (1991). *Strategy Implementation, nature of the problem:* International Review of strategic management vol 2, pp 73-91

Ansoff, H.I. & McDonnell, E. (1990). *Implanting Strategic Management (2nd ed)*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall

Aosa, E. (1992). *An Empirical Investigation of Aspects of Strategy Formulation and Implementation within Large Private Manufacturing Companies in Kenya.* Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Strathclyde U.K

Bateman, T & Zeithaml, C (1990). *Management function and strategy*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina

Barney, J.B (1991). *Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage*: Journal of Management vol 17, pp 99-120

Burnes, B. (2004). *A strategic approach to organizational dynamics;(4th ed).* Hampshire: Ashford Colour Press Ltd.

Burns, R. B& Burns, R. A (2008). *Business Research methods and statistics using SPSS.* Sage Publications Limited

Capon, C. (2008). *Understanding strategic Management*. Staffordshire University: Prentice Hall

Central Bank of Kenya (2012). *Economic Report for the Financial Year Ended 2012*. Central Bank of Kenya.

Central Bank of Kenya (2013). *Developments in the Banking Sector. Bank. Supervision Annual Report 2013*. Central Bank of Kenya.

Chandler, A. (1962). *Strategy and Structure: Chapters in the History of American Industrial Enterprise*. New York: Cambridge Massachusetts, MIT pres.

Clegg, S, Carter, C, Kornberger, M & Schweitzer, J (2011). *Strategy theory and practice.* Sage Publications Limited

Corby, M & O'Corrbui, D (2009). *Successful strategy implementation.*

David, F.R. (2003. *Strategic Management Concepts. (9th ed*). Prentice Hall

Ernest and young (2012). The voice of today Banking Customer. *Global Consumer Banking Survey,2012*. Retrieved from http://new.erg.com/GL/en Haynes, W & Mukherjee, S (2001). *21st Century management*. Calcutta: Central Educational Enterprises

Ireland, R.D. & Huskisson, R.E & Hitt, M.A. (2013). *The Management of Strategy. Concepts and Cases 10th ed*, Canada.

Johnson, G. & Scholes, K (1997). *Exploring Corporate Strategy; (3rd ed).* New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India.

Johnson, G. & Scholes, K (2003). *Exploring Corporate Strategy; (6th ed).* New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India.

Johnson, G & Scholes, K & Whittington, R. (2008). *Exploring Corporate strategy; 8th ed*. Pearson Education Limited

Kaplan, R. S & Norton, D. P (1992). *The balanced scorecard- measures that Drive performance*: Harvard Business review, January- February, 71-114.

Kothari, C.R (2004). *Research methodology*, New Age international

Lynch, R (2009). *Strategic Management; (5th ed).* Delhi: Prentice hall Macmillan

Tampoe, M (2000). *Strategic Management process, content and implementation*. New York: Oxford University Press

Mburu, M. (2011), *Strategy implementation and performance in Barclays Kenya*. Unpublished MBA Research project, University of Nairobi

Mugenda, M, O & Mugenda, G, A (2003). Research Methods.*Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*, Nairobi: Acts Press.

Ndungu, C. (2013), Strategy implementation process in Public institutions in Kenya Unpublished MBA research project, University of Nairobi

Okumus, F & Roper, A (1998). *Great strategy.Shame about implementation*. Proceeding of the 7th annual Hospitality research conference, Glasgow

Pearce, J. A & Robinson, R.B. (1997). *Strategic Management: Formulation, Implementation and Control*. Boston, U.S.A: Irwin McGraw-Hill

Pearce, J. A & Robinson, R.B. (2007).*Strategic Management: Formulation, Implementation and Control*. Boston, U.S.A:Irwin McGraw-Hill

Pearce II, J. A, Robinson, R. B & Mital, A (2010).*Strategic Management Formulation implementation and Control*;(10th ed). New Delhi: Tata Mcgraw-Hill

Pearce II, J. A & Robinson, R. B (2011). *Strategic Management formulation, implementation and Control;(12th ed*). New Delhi: Tata Mcgraw-Hill

Porter, M. (1996). *Competitive Strategy*. Free Press.

Schein, E.H (1992). *Organizational culture and Leadership*. San Francisco Schultz, T.W (1961). *Investment in Human capital*. University of Chicago

Thompson, A. A & Strickland, J.A. (1989). *Strategy formulation and implementation*. New York, U.S.A: Irwin McGraw-Hill

Thompson, A. A & Strickland, J.A. (2003). *Crafting and Executing Strategy*. New York, U.S.A: Irwin McGraw-Hill

Wheelen, T. L & Hunger, J.D. (2008). *Strategic Management and Business Policy*: *Concepts and Cases.(11th ed*). Prentice Hall.