



# International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews

Journal Homepage: [www.ijrpr.com](http://www.ijrpr.com) ISSN 2582-7421

## Organizational Internal Dynamics and Execution of Strategies in Public Service Water Providers in Kitui County, Kenya

**Mukola Damaris Wambua<sup>1</sup> and Dr. Anthony Mwendwa<sup>2</sup>**

Department of Business Administration, School of Business and Entrepreneurship, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Kenya

### ABSTRACT

Strategy execution remains a major challenge in public sector organizations even where formal strategic plans exist. In public water service providers, effective execution is particularly important because strategic decisions influence service reliability, operational efficiency, institutional accountability and community welfare. This study examined the effect of organizational internal dynamics on strategy execution among public service water providers in Kitui County, Kenya. Specifically, the study assessed organizational culture, resource allocation, organizational structure and organizational leadership as determinants of strategy execution. The study was anchored on the Resource-Based View, Institutional Theory and Contingency Theory. A descriptive survey design was adopted. The target population comprised 120 supervisors and technical staff from KITWASCO and KIMWASCO, from which 92 respondents were sampled using stratified random sampling. Structured questionnaires were used to collect primary data. Ninety-two questionnaires were distributed and 89 were returned; four were excluded because of incompleteness or double marking, leaving 85 valid questionnaires for analysis, equivalent to a 92.4% valid response rate. Reliability was high, with Cronbach's alpha coefficients ranging from 0.898 to 0.980 and an overall coefficient of 0.989. KMO values ranged from 0.798 to 0.884 and Bartlett's tests were significant at  $p < .05$ , supporting instrument adequacy. Multiple regression produced  $R = .935$ ,  $R^2 = .874$  and adjusted  $R^2 = .868$ . The overall model was significant,  $F(4,80) = 139.333$ ,  $p < .001$ . Organizational culture significantly predicted strategy execution ( $B = .315$ ,  $\beta = .333$ ,  $p = .004$ ), as did organizational leadership ( $B = .280$ ,  $\beta = .281$ ,  $p = .022$ ). Resource allocation ( $B = .176$ ,  $\beta = .174$ ,  $p = .155$ ) and organizational structure ( $B = .176$ ,  $\beta = .184$ ,  $p = .064$ ) were positive but not statistically significant at the 5% level. The study concludes that supportive culture and effective leadership are especially important for translating strategic plans into action, while resource allocation and structure remain enabling conditions requiring continued strengthening.

*Keywords: organizational culture; resource allocation; organizational structure; organizational leadership; strategy execution; public water service providers; Kitui County*

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Strategy execution is the process through which strategic intentions are translated into coordinated organizational action and measurable outcomes. The literature cited in the source study emphasizes that organizations may possess well-formulated strategies yet struggle to implement them because internal processes, resources, structures and leadership are not aligned with strategic priorities. Hrebiniak (2006) identifies implementation barriers as a central strategic-management concern, while Cater and Pucko (2010) demonstrate that effective execution depends on organizational conditions that support the movement from plans to action.

The challenge is particularly important in public service organizations. Unlike private firms, public utilities are judged not only by financial outcomes but also by the quality, reliability and accessibility of services provided to citizens. Public water service providers must therefore coordinate technical operations, human resources, finances, infrastructure and institutional accountability while responding to regulatory and community expectations. The source study places this challenge within Kitui County, an area characterized by water-service pressures and a demanding operating environment.

In Kenya, the source study identifies organizational culture, resource allocation, organizational structure and organizational leadership as four internal dynamics that can either enable or constrain execution. Organizational culture shapes shared values, teamwork, commitment and accountability. Resource allocation determines whether financial, human and technological resources are available when required. Organizational structure defines roles, reporting relationships, communication channels and decision-making arrangements. Leadership provides strategic direction, communicates objectives and mobilizes employees around implementation.

The empirical problem addressed by the study is therefore not simply whether public water providers possess strategic plans, but whether their internal organizational arrangements allow those plans to be implemented effectively. Evidence in the project indicates that 74.1% of respondents knew that a written strategic plan existed, but 44.7% reported that the plan was not accessible to staff. This points to a practical gap between strategic formulation and employee-level access to strategic information.

The study focused on KITWASCO and KIMWASCO and excluded top-level managers because of their direct involvement in strategy formulation. The analysis consequently emphasizes the experiences of supervisors and technical employees who participate in day-to-day execution. The study's general objective was to examine the effect of organizational internal dynamics on strategy execution in public service water providers in Kitui County, Kenya.

---

## 2. PROBLEM STATEMENT

Public water provision in Kitui County operates within a setting in which reliable water access has important social and economic implications. The source study notes persistent concerns around water scarcity, service coverage, operational inefficiencies, resource constraints and institutional capacity. These pressures make strategy execution a practical management issue rather than an abstract strategic exercise. A strategic plan that is not understood, resourced, communicated and acted upon cannot easily translate into improved service outcomes.

The problem is also organizational. The source project reports that weak shared values, limited employee commitment, resource misalignment, rigid structures and insufficient leadership capacity can weaken the execution of strategic initiatives. Such weaknesses can create delays between strategic decisions and operational action. For example, if employees cannot readily access the strategic plan, they may understand their immediate duties without understanding how those duties contribute to broader strategic objectives. Similarly, resources that are available but allocated late may fail to support activities at the point when implementation requires them.

The findings provide empirical evidence of this implementation context. Three-quarters of respondents (75.3%) reported that the mission statement was displayed in all offices, while 24.7% reported that it was not. Likewise, 74.1% confirmed the existence of a written strategic plan, but 25.9% did not know whether such a plan existed. Most importantly, 44.7% considered the strategic plan inaccessible, compared with 28.2% who considered it moderately accessible and 27.1% who considered it easily accessible. These figures suggest that formal strategic instruments existed, but dissemination and accessibility were incomplete.

The research therefore addressed a contextual and sectoral gap. Previous studies cited in the project examined strategy implementation in insurance firms, county governments, NGOs, state corporations, local authorities, SACCOs and other water-sector settings. Their findings provide useful foundations, but the source study argues that evidence specifically concerning public water service providers in Kitui County remains limited. The present study responds to that gap by bringing four internal dynamics into one explanatory model and examining their combined effect on strategy execution.

The study was guided by four specific objectives: to establish the effect of organizational culture; determine the effect of resource allocation; examine the effect of organizational structure; and assess the effect of organizational leadership on strategy execution in public water service providers in Kitui County.

---

## 3. THEORETICAL AND EMPIRICAL REVIEW

### Resource-Based View Theory

The Resource-Based View (RBV) treats an organization as a collection of resources and capabilities that can support performance when they are appropriately developed and deployed. Wernerfelt (1984) and Barney (1991) provide the theoretical foundation cited in the source project. Applied to public water providers, the theory does not imply market competition alone; rather, internal capabilities can support efficiency, service delivery and stakeholder confidence. Organizational culture and leadership can be understood as intangible capabilities, while financial, human, technological and physical resources provide operational capacity.

### Institutional Theory

Institutional Theory explains how formal rules, norms and enforcement mechanisms shape organizational behaviour. North (1990) emphasizes the role of institutions in structuring interaction, while Meyer and Rowan (1991) and DiMaggio and Powell (1991) explain how organizations may adopt formal practices for legitimacy and may become similar because of coercive, normative and mimetic pressures. For public water providers, regulatory requirements, county policies and professional expectations may shape structure, accountability, reporting and strategic routines. The theory helps explain why formal strategic systems can exist even when day-to-day implementation remains uneven.

### Contingency Theory

Contingency Theory holds that organizational effectiveness depends on the fit between organizational arrangements and contextual conditions. Fiedler (1964), Lawrence and Lorsch (1967), and Snow and Hrebiniak (1980) are used in the source study to emphasize alignment among leadership, structure, strategy and environment. This is relevant to Kitui County because water providers operate under technical, regulatory, resource and environmental pressures that require internal arrangements capable of adapting to local conditions.

---

## 4. CONCEPTUAL MODEL

The research gap identified in the source project has contextual, sectoral and conceptual dimensions. Kirui (2013) examined local authorities in Migori County; Abok et al. (2013) focused on NGOs in Nairobi; Khayota (2014) examined the Lake Victoria South Water Services Board; and Warui et al. (2015) studied rural mission hospitals. These studies established relationships between organizational factors and strategy implementation, but their

institutional settings differ from public water providers in Kitui County. The source study therefore argues that their findings cannot simply be transferred without considering the local water-service context.

The study's conceptual model treats organizational culture, resource allocation, organizational structure and organizational leadership as independent variables and strategy execution as the dependent variable. The culture indicators are commitment, shared values and teamwork. Resource allocation is represented by financial resources, human resources and asset or technology availability. Structure is represented by centralization/decentralization, formalization, task allocation, communication and decision-making. Leadership is represented by conflict resolution, employee involvement, strategic communication and commitment. Strategy execution is assessed through implementation effectiveness, goal achievement, timeliness, employee involvement and departmental autonomy.

| Variable                  | Key indicators                                                          | Expected relationship |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Organizational culture    | Shared values; teamwork; accountability; commitment                     | Positive              |
| Resource allocation       | Financial; human; technology/equipment; timeliness                      | Positive              |
| Organizational structure  | Roles; communication; decision-making; coordination                     | Positive              |
| Organizational leadership | Communication; support; motivation; commitment                          | Positive              |
| Strategy execution        | Plan implementation; autonomy; employee involvement; management support | Dependent variable    |

The study tested the general proposition that stronger internal organizational dynamics are associated with stronger strategy execution. The multiple regression model was specified as  $Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + \beta_3X_3 + \beta_4X_4 + \epsilon$ , where Y represents strategy execution; X1 organizational culture; X2 resource allocation; X3 organizational structure; X4 organizational leadership;  $\beta_0$  is the constant;  $\beta_1$ – $\beta_4$  are regression coefficients; and  $\epsilon$  is the error term.

## 5. METHODOLOGY

### *Research design and population*

The study adopted a descriptive survey research design. The design was selected because it enabled the researcher to collect standardized information about respondents' perceptions of organizational conditions and strategy execution. The target population comprised supervisors and technical staff in the two public water service providers in Kitui County, KITWASCO and KIMWASCO. The target population was 120 employees: KITWASCO had 8 supervisors and 67 technical staff, while KIMWASCO had 7 supervisors and 38 technical staff. Top-level managers were excluded because they participated directly in strategy formulation.

### *Sampling and data collection*

A stratified random sampling technique was used to ensure representation of the identified staff categories. The intended sample was 92 respondents. The sampling frame allocated 6 KITWASCO supervisors, 52 KITWASCO technical staff, 5 KIMWASCO supervisors and 29 KIMWASCO technical staff. Primary data were collected using a structured questionnaire with close-ended items. The questionnaire contained demographic questions and five-point Likert-scale items measuring strategy execution, organizational culture, resource allocation, organizational structure and organizational leadership.

### *Instrument quality*

The research instrument was pilot tested before the main study. Reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha, while validity was examined using Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measures and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity. The source project reports Cronbach's alpha values above the commonly used .70 threshold for all constructs. KMO values were also above .79, while Bartlett's tests were statistically significant, indicating that the data structure was appropriate for the intended analysis.

## 6. RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY RESULTS

The quality assessment showed that the questionnaire had strong internal consistency. Organizational culture recorded Cronbach's alpha of .899; resource allocation .898; organizational structure .907; organizational leadership .980; and strategy execution .980. The overall coefficient for the 20 items was .989. These values indicate that the items were highly consistent in measuring their respective constructs. The source study also notes that very high coefficients above .95 can sometimes signal item redundancy, so the exceptionally high coefficients should be interpreted as evidence of consistency rather than as proof that every item is uniquely informative.

| Construct                 | Items | Cronbach's $\alpha$ | Interpretation                 |
|---------------------------|-------|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| Organizational culture    | 4     | .899                | Reliable                       |
| Resource allocation       | 4     | .898                | Reliable                       |
| Organizational structure  | 4     | .907                | Reliable                       |
| Organizational leadership | 4     | .980                | Highly reliable                |
| Strategy execution        | 4     | .980                | Highly reliable                |
| All constructs            | 20    | .989                | Very high internal consistency |

## 7. ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AND STRATEGY EXECUTION

| Statement                                              | Mean | SD    |
|--------------------------------------------------------|------|-------|
| Culture supports strategic-plan implementation         | 3.66 | 1.249 |
| Employees understand and embrace organizational values | 3.69 | 1.134 |
| Teamwork enhances strategy execution                   | 3.75 | 1.133 |
| Culture promotes accountability                        | 3.65 | 1.141 |

Respondents generally agreed that organizational culture supports strategy execution. Mean scores ranged from 3.65 to 3.75, with teamwork recording the highest score ( $M = 3.75$ ,  $SD = 1.133$ ). This indicates that collaborative work is perceived as a particularly important mechanism through which employees coordinate implementation activities. Understanding and embracing organizational values also scored positively ( $M = 3.69$ ,  $SD = 1.134$ ), while support for strategic-plan implementation and accountability recorded  $M = 3.66$  and  $M = 3.65$  respectively.

The descriptive results are reinforced by regression analysis. Organizational culture had a positive and statistically significant effect on strategy execution ( $B = .315$ ,  $\beta = .333$ ,  $t = 2.993$ ,  $p = .004$ ). The standardized coefficient of .333 was the largest among the four predictors, making culture the strongest predictor in the model. Holding the other variables constant, a one-unit improvement in organizational culture was associated with a .315-unit increase in strategy execution.

The result supports the theoretical argument that internal organizational capabilities matter for performance. A culture characterized by shared values, teamwork and accountability can reduce fragmentation and strengthen collective action. It also agrees with the empirical studies cited in the source project, including Kibicho (2015), Kagumu (2018), and Kavale and Muthoni (2015), which associate supportive organizational cultures with successful strategy implementation.

The implication for public water providers is that strategy execution should not be treated solely as a technical or budgeting exercise. Management needs to cultivate behavioural conditions that encourage cooperation, responsibility and commitment. Team-based implementation routines, value communication, recognition of responsible performance and accountability mechanisms can reinforce the cultural conditions required for execution.

The finding is consistent with the study's conceptual model and provides the clearest evidence among the four predictors that internal organizational dynamics directly influence implementation outcomes.

## 8. RESOURCE ALLOCATION AND STRATEGY EXECUTION

| Statement                          | Mean | SD    |
|------------------------------------|------|-------|
| Adequate financial resources       | 3.66 | 1.129 |
| Sufficient human resources         | 3.60 | 1.136 |
| Necessary technology and equipment | 3.61 | 1.103 |
| Timely allocation of resources     | 3.71 | 1.089 |

Respondents generally agreed that resources were available to support strategy execution, with mean scores between 3.60 and 3.71. Timely resource allocation received the highest rating ( $M = 3.71$ ,  $SD = 1.089$ ), followed by adequate financial resources ( $M = 3.66$ ,  $SD = 1.129$ ). Technology and equipment scored 3.61, while human-resource sufficiency scored 3.60. The pattern indicates that respondents recognized resource availability as an important implementation condition, but the moderate rather than very high means also indicate room for improvement.

The regression results provide a more nuanced interpretation. Resource allocation had a positive coefficient ( $B = .176$ ,  $\beta = .174$ ), but the effect was not statistically significant at the 5% level ( $t = 1.437$ ,  $p = .155$ ). Thus, the descriptive evidence suggests that resources matter in practice, while the multivariate

evidence indicates that resource allocation did not make a statistically significant independent contribution after culture, structure and leadership were controlled.

The findings nevertheless align with strategic-management literature cited in the project. Pearce and Robinson (2013) emphasize alignment of financial, human and physical resources with strategic priorities, while Kaplan and Norton (2001) highlight the importance of linking budgets and operational systems to strategic objectives. Thompson, Strickland and Gamble (2014) similarly emphasize committing resources to strategically important activities.

Management should therefore continue strengthening resource planning while linking budgets, staffing and technology to measurable implementation milestones.

## 9. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND STRATEGY EXECUTION

| Statement                                      | Mean | SD    |
|------------------------------------------------|------|-------|
| Structure supports effective implementation    | 3.80 | 1.111 |
| Roles and responsibilities are clearly defined | 3.67 | 1.159 |
| Communication channels facilitate coordination | 3.66 | 1.140 |
| Decision-making supports timely implementation | 3.72 | 1.181 |

Organizational structure was positively rated across all four indicators. The highest mean was for the proposition that organizational structure supports effective implementation ( $M = 3.80$ ,  $SD = 1.111$ ). Decision-making processes supporting timely implementation scored 3.72, while role clarity and communication channels recorded 3.67 and 3.66 respectively. These findings suggest that respondents generally viewed the existing organizational arrangements as supportive of coordination and implementation.

However, the regression results qualify the descriptive evidence. Organizational structure had a positive coefficient ( $B = .176$ ,  $\beta = .184$ ), but its independent effect was not statistically significant at the 5% level ( $t = 1.880$ ,  $p = .064$ ). The p-value is close to the conventional threshold, so the result indicates a positive tendency but insufficient evidence to conclude a statistically significant independent effect within this sample.

The finding may indicate that structural conditions operate through other organizational mechanisms. Clear reporting relationships, communication and decision-making may be most effective when supported by leadership and a culture of cooperation. A formal structure can specify who is responsible for an activity, but it cannot by itself ensure that employees communicate, collaborate or accept accountability. This interpretation is consistent with the source study's use of Institutional and Contingency Theory.

The descriptive evidence remains practically important. If roles are unclear, implementation can be delayed; if decision-making is excessively centralized, responsiveness can be reduced; and if communication channels are weak, departments may operate in isolation. The source project therefore recommends continuous review of organizational structures, clearer role definitions, efficient communication and appropriate decentralization.

The findings are broadly consistent with Rajasekar (2014), Abok et al. (2013), Dahiye and Gekara (2019), and Ben et al. (2020), whose studies associate organizational structure with strategy implementation. The present study adds the important qualification that, in the Kitui water-provider context, structure was positive but not independently significant at  $p < .05$ .

## 10. ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND STRATEGY EXECUTION

| Statement                                     | Mean | SD    |
|-----------------------------------------------|------|-------|
| Leaders actively support implementation       | 3.71 | 1.153 |
| Leaders communicate strategic objectives      | 3.75 | 1.068 |
| Leaders motivate employees                    | 3.65 | 1.088 |
| Leadership commitment supports implementation | 3.73 | 1.179 |

The leadership findings show consistently positive perceptions. Communication of strategic objectives recorded the highest mean ( $M = 3.75$ ,  $SD = 1.068$ ), followed by leadership commitment ( $M = 3.73$ ,  $SD = 1.179$ ), active leadership support ( $M = 3.71$ ,  $SD = 1.153$ ) and employee motivation ( $M = 3.65$ ,  $SD = 1.088$ ). These results indicate that respondents recognized leadership as an important mechanism for translating strategic priorities into employee action.

Regression analysis confirmed a statistically significant relationship. Organizational leadership had  $B = .280$ ,  $\beta = .281$ ,  $t = 2.335$  and  $p = .022$ . The positive coefficient indicates that improvements in leadership effectiveness were associated with improvements in strategy execution after controlling for culture, resources and structure. A one-unit increase in leadership effectiveness corresponded to an estimated .280-unit increase in strategy execution, holding other variables constant.

The result is consistent with the empirical literature reviewed in the source project. Mwirigi et al. (2014) link leadership with organizational success through vision and motivation; Ogara et al. (2018) identify leadership as a driver of organizational change; Abbas et al. (2017) emphasize leadership commitment; and Mbogo et al. (2020) and Nzulwa and Odanga (2016) report positive relationships between leadership and strategic-plan implementation.

Leadership is particularly relevant where employees must translate broad strategic objectives into operational tasks. Leaders communicate priorities, resolve implementation barriers, coordinate departments, motivate staff and demonstrate commitment to strategic objectives. The findings therefore suggest that leadership development should focus not only on administrative authority but also on communication, employee involvement, accountability and change management. The significance of leadership, alongside the stronger significance of culture, indicates that people-centred internal dynamics are central to strategy execution in the sampled public water providers. Strengthening leadership practices can also reinforce culture by demonstrating expected behaviours and by creating opportunities for employees to participate in implementation.

## 11. STRATEGY EXECUTION OUTCOMES

| Strategy-execution indicator                        | Mean | SD    |
|-----------------------------------------------------|------|-------|
| Organization effectively implements strategic plans | 3.69 | 1.145 |
| Employees actively involved                         | 3.58 | 1.148 |
| Departments have adequate autonomy                  | 3.75 | 1.068 |
| Management support facilitates execution            | 3.59 | 1.083 |

The dependent variable was assessed through four indicators. Departmental autonomy received the highest mean ( $M = 3.75$ ,  $SD = 1.068$ ), followed by effective implementation of strategic plans ( $M = 3.69$ ,  $SD = 1.145$ ). Management support scored 3.59 and employee involvement 3.58. Overall, respondents agreed that strategy execution was taking place, but the relatively lower scores for employee involvement and management support point to opportunities for improvement.

The results are important because they show that execution is not simply a binary condition. Organizations may implement strategic plans while still experiencing weaknesses in employee participation, management support or communication. The moderate-to-positive ratings indicate a functioning implementation environment, but they also suggest that execution can be strengthened by improving the human and managerial systems surrounding formal plans.

The finding on departmental autonomy is especially notable. Giving departments sufficient discretion can allow employees to respond to operational realities within their areas of responsibility. However, autonomy needs to be accompanied by accountability, communication and clear strategic priorities. Otherwise, decentralized decision-making can create inconsistent implementation. This balance is consistent with the Contingency Theory perspective used in the study.

The accessibility findings reported earlier reinforce this interpretation. If 44.7% of employees consider the strategic plan inaccessible, autonomy may be exercised without complete knowledge of strategic targets. The organizations can therefore improve execution by ensuring that autonomy is matched with access to strategic information, measurable departmental objectives and regular performance feedback.

Hrebiniak (2006) emphasizes alignment among resources, structures and employee behaviour, while Kaplan and Norton (2001) emphasize translating strategy into actionable activities supported by organizational systems. The current findings support these principles in the Kitui water-provider context.

## 12. MULTIPLE REGRESSION RESULTS

| Predictor                 | B    | Std. Error | Beta | t     | p    |
|---------------------------|------|------------|------|-------|------|
| Constant                  | .616 | .620       | —    | .993  | .324 |
| Organizational culture    | .315 | .105       | .333 | 2.993 | .004 |
| Resource allocation       | .176 | .123       | .174 | 1.437 | .155 |
| Organizational structure  | .176 | .094       | .184 | 1.880 | .064 |
| Organizational leadership | .280 | .120       | .281 | 2.335 | .022 |

The regression model produced a very strong overall relationship between the four internal-dynamics variables and strategy execution ( $R = .935$ ). The coefficient of determination was  $R^2 = .874$ , meaning that 87.4% of the observed variation in strategy execution was explained jointly by organizational culture, resource allocation, organizational structure and organizational leadership. The adjusted  $R^2$  of .868 indicates that the model retained substantial explanatory power after adjustment for the number of predictors. The standard error of the estimate was 1.40281.

The results identify organizational culture as the strongest standardized predictor ( $\beta = .333$ ,  $p = .004$ ), followed by organizational leadership ( $\beta = .281$ ,  $p = .022$ ). Resource allocation ( $\beta = .174$ ,  $p = .155$ ) and organizational structure ( $\beta = .184$ ,  $p = .064$ ) were positive but did not meet the 5% significance criterion.

The regression equation based on the unstandardized coefficients is: Strategy Execution =  $0.616 + 0.315(\text{Organizational Culture}) + 0.176(\text{Resource Allocation}) + 0.176(\text{Organizational Structure}) + 0.280(\text{Organizational Leadership}) + \epsilon$ .

The collective explanatory power is important because it suggests that strategy execution is shaped by a system of interacting internal conditions rather than a single organizational practice. The result strongly supports the general argument of the study that internal organizational dynamics matter for implementation. At the same time, the individual coefficients show that not every internal factor makes an equally strong independent contribution.

The non-significant resource-allocation and structure coefficients should not be interpreted as meaning that resources or structure are irrelevant. Both coefficients are positive, and their descriptive means were also positive. Rather, the evidence indicates that their independent effects were not statistically distinguishable from zero at the selected 5% threshold once the other variables were included in the model.

### 13. ANOVA AND INTEGRATED DISCUSSION

| Source     | SS       | df | MS      | F       | p    |
|------------|----------|----|---------|---------|------|
| Regression | 1096.759 | 4  | 274.190 | 139.333 | .000 |
| Residual   | 157.429  | 80 | 1.968   |         |      |
| Total      | 1254.188 | 84 |         |         |      |

The ANOVA results demonstrate that the overall regression model was statistically significant,  $F(4,80) = 139.333$ ,  $p < .001$ . The model therefore provides a substantially better explanation of strategy execution than a model containing no predictors. This result supports rejection of the null proposition that organizational internal dynamics have no collective influence on strategy execution.

The integrated findings provide three important insights. First, organizational culture and leadership are the most clearly supported independent predictors. Second, resource allocation and organizational structure remain positively associated with strategy execution, but their independent statistical effects are weaker within the sampled organizations. Third, the combined model explains a very large proportion of variation in strategy execution. The findings therefore support a systems perspective in which internal dynamics operate together.

The results are consistent with the Resource-Based View because culture, leadership capability and organizational resources represent internal assets that can contribute to effective service delivery when properly organized and deployed. They are also consistent with Contingency Theory because effective execution depends on fit between internal arrangements and the operating environment. Institutional Theory adds an explanation of how public-sector rules, reporting systems and formal structures can shape implementation behaviour.

The findings also contribute to the empirical literature by showing that relationships established in other Kenyan organizational settings are broadly visible in public water service providers in Kitui County, but not necessarily with identical statistical strength. For example, structure was descriptively positive and close to the 5% significance threshold, yet  $p = .064$ . Resource allocation was positively rated but  $p = .155$ . These results caution against assuming that every organizational factor operates independently in the same way across sectors and contexts.

### 14. IMPLICATIONS FOR PUBLIC WATER-SERVICE MANAGEMENT

#### *Managerial implications*

The strongest practical implication is the need to treat strategy execution as an organizational process rather than a document-compliance exercise. The finding that organizational culture was the strongest predictor suggests that management should deliberately create a working environment in which employees understand organizational values, cooperate across functions and accept accountability for implementation. Teamwork should therefore be linked to specific strategic activities and performance expectations.

Leadership should similarly be treated as an execution capability. Leaders need to communicate strategic objectives in ways that connect organizational goals with employees' daily responsibilities. Regular departmental briefings, implementation reviews and feedback mechanisms can make strategic priorities more visible. Leadership development should emphasize communication, employee involvement, conflict management, accountability and change leadership.

Resource systems should be strengthened by linking annual budgets and staffing plans to strategic priorities. The positive but non-significant coefficient suggests that the issue may be less about the existence of resources and more about how they are prioritized, timed and utilized. Management can therefore use implementation milestones to trigger resource reviews and reallocation when strategic activities fall behind.

Organizational structures should also be periodically reviewed. The descriptive evidence indicates that employees generally view structure as supportive, but the independent effect was not statistically significant. This suggests that structural improvements should focus on practical bottlenecks role ambiguity, communication delays and decision-making processes rather than simply adding hierarchical layers.

### ***Policy implications***

The source project recommends that the Water Services Regulatory Board (WASREB) and county governments support institutional systems that strengthen strategy execution. Policy frameworks can encourage leadership development, organizational culture transformation, staff participation and institutional capacity building. The policy implication is not to prescribe one universal organizational model, but to encourage water providers to develop internal systems that are responsive to their operational context.

### ***Contribution to knowledge***

The study contributes context-specific evidence on strategy execution in Kenyan public water utilities. Its principal contribution is the joint assessment of four internal dynamics and the demonstration that culture and leadership have significant independent effects while resources and structure are positive but statistically weaker predictors. The result provides a useful basis for further comparative research across counties and public utilities.

---

## **15. CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATIONS AND LIMITATIONS**

### ***Conclusion***

The study concludes that organizational internal dynamics collectively play a critical role in strategy execution among public service water providers in Kitui County. Organizational culture emerged as the strongest predictor, emphasizing the importance of teamwork, shared values, accountability and employee commitment. Organizational leadership also had a significant positive effect, demonstrating the importance of strategic communication, leadership commitment, employee motivation and management support.

Resource allocation and organizational structure had positive coefficients but did not achieve statistical significance at the 5% level. Nevertheless, their descriptive results show that employees regard timely resources, role clarity, communication and decision-making as important implementation conditions. The study therefore concludes that these factors should continue to be strengthened as enabling systems.

### ***Recommendations***

- Strengthen teamwork, shared values, accountability and employee commitment through sensitization, team-building and value-based management.
- Improve access to strategic plans through staff meetings, departmental briefings, digital platforms and implementation training.
- Align financial, human and technological resource plans with strategic priorities and implementation milestones.
- Review organizational structures regularly, with emphasis on role clarity, communication efficiency and appropriately decentralized decision-making.
- Develop leadership capacity in strategic communication, participatory management, accountability, conflict resolution and employee empowerment.
- WASREB and county governments should support institutional-capacity frameworks that strengthen leadership, culture and implementation systems.

### ***Limitations***

The study was limited to public water service providers in Kitui County, so generalization to all Kenyan water providers should be made cautiously. The study also relied on self-reported questionnaire data, which may be affected by perceptions or response bias. In addition, only four internal dynamics were examined. Political influence, technological change, external environmental conditions and stakeholder pressures were outside the model.

### ***Further research***

Future research should compare water providers across counties, examine external environmental influences, assess the moderating role of technology adoption, investigate stakeholder participation and use longitudinal designs to examine how internal dynamics affect strategy execution over time.

## **REFERENCES**

---

- Abok, A. M., Gakure, R. W., & Ogutu, M. (2013). Factors affecting effective strategy implementation in non-governmental organizations in Kenya. *Journal of Management and Business Studies*, 5(2), 89–97.
- Amenta, E. (2005). State-centered and political institutional theory. In *The Handbook of Political Sociology* (pp. 96–114).
- Barney, J. B. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99–120.
- Barney, J. B. (2012). Purchasing, supply chain management and sustained competitive advantage: The relevance of resource-based theory. *Journal of Supply Chain Management*, 48(2), 3–6.
- Ben, S., Oyugi, L. A., & Iravo, M. A. (2020). Influence of organizational structure on strategy implementation among SACCOs in Kakamega County, Kenya. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 8(4), 45–56.

- Brenes, E. R., Mena, M., & Molina, G. E. (2008). Key success factors for strategy implementation in Latin America. *Journal of Business Research*, 61(6), 590–598.
- Bryman, A., & Bell, E. (2011). *Business research methods* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Cater, T., & Pucko, D. (2010). Factors of effective strategy implementation: Empirical evidence from Slovenian business practice. *Journal for East European Management Studies*, 15, 207–236.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16(3), 297–334.
- Dahiye, A. M., & Gekara, M. G. (2019). Determinants of strategy implementation in state corporations in Kenya. *Strategic Journal of Business and Change Management*, 6(2), 123–138.
- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1991). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality. In *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis* (pp. 63–82).
- Fiedler, F. E. (1964). A contingency model of leadership effectiveness. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 1, 149–190.
- Friedman, R., Lipshitz, R., & Popper, M. (2014). Organizational learning mechanisms: A structural and cultural approach to organizational learning. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 40(2), 147–169.
- Guohui, S., & Eppler, M. J. (2008). Making strategy work: A literature review on the factors influencing strategy implementation. *Business School, Central University of Finance and Economics*.
- Hitt, M. A., Ireland, R. D., & Hoskisson, R. E. (2013). *Strategic management: Competitiveness and globalization*. Cengage Learning.
- Hrebiniak, L. G. (2006). Obstacles to effective strategy implementation. *Organizational Dynamics*, 35(1), 12–31.
- Hrebiniak, L. G., & Joyce, W. F. (2005). *Implementing strategy: An appraisal and agenda for future research*.
- Johnson, G. (2002). Managing strategic change—strategy, culture and action. *Long Range Planning*, 25(1), 28–36.
- Kagumu, J. G., & Njuguna, R. (2016). Organizational factors influencing strategy implementation in the Anglican Church of Kenya: The case of Kirinyaga Diocese, Kenya. *International Journal of Current Business and Social Sciences*, 1(5), 350–385.
- Kagumu, L. K. (2018). Organizational culture and strategy implementation in county governments in Kenya. *International Journal of Strategic Management*, 7(1), 23–35.
- Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (2001). *Strategy-focused organization: How balanced scorecard companies thrive in the new business environment*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Kasongo, M., & Misango, S. B. (2019). Effect of organizational culture on strategy implementation in public institutions in Kenya. *International Journal of Current Aspects in Human Resource Management*, 1(3), 11–24.
- Kavale, S., & Muthoni, J. (2015). Influence of organizational culture on strategy implementation in water companies in Kenya. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 10(7), 83–92.
- Kerzner, H. (2001). *Strategic planning for project management using a project management maturity model*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Khayota, C. M. (2014). *Organizational culture and strategy implementation at Lake Victoria South Water Services Board* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Nairobi, Kenya.
- Kibera, F. N., Munyoki, J. M., & Kibera, J. (2014). *Fundamentals of strategic management*. Kenya Literature Bureau.
- Kibicho, P. M. (2015). Determinants of strategy implementation in insurance firms in Kenya. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 6(6), 123–132.
- Kirui, J. K. (2013). *Organizational structure and strategy implementation in local authorities in Migori County, Kenya* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Nairobi, Kenya.
- Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research methodology: Methods and techniques* (2nd ed.). New Age International Publishers.
- Kotter, J. P., & Heskett, J. L. (1992). *Corporate culture and performance*. Free Press.
- Lawrence, P. R., & Lorsch, J. W. (1967). *Organization and environment: Managing differentiation and integration*. Harvard University Press.
- Mehta, S., & Krishnan, V. R. (2004). Impact of organizational culture and influence tactics on transformational leadership. *Journal of Management and Labor Studies*, 29(4), 281–290.
- Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1991). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. In *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis* (pp. 41–62).
- Mintzberg, H., Ahlstrand, B., & Lampel, J. (2009). *Strategy safari: A guided tour through the wilds of strategic management* (2nd ed.). Pearson Education.

- Mugenda, O. M., & Mugenda, A. G. (2003). *Research methods: Quantitative and qualitative approaches*. Acts Press.
- Mwirigi, F. M., Mbogori, T. N., & Karanja, K. (2014). Organizational culture and strategy implementation in non-governmental organizations in Kenya. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Entrepreneurship*, 1(11), 300–312.
- North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change and economic performance*. Cambridge University Press.
- Pearce, J. A., & Robinson, R. B. (2013). *Strategic management: Planning for domestic and global competition* (13th ed.). McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Peteraf, M. A. (1993). The cornerstones of competitive advantage: A resource-based view. *Strategic Management Journal*, 14(3), 179–191.
- Rajasekar, J. (2014). Factors affecting effective strategy implementation in a service industry: A study of the Omani service sector. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 5(9), 169–183.
- Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2010). *Research methods for business: A skill-building approach* (5th ed.). Wiley.
- Shafritz, J. M., Russell, E. W., & Borick, C. (2012). *Introducing public administration* (7th ed.). Pearson.
- Snow, C. C., & Hrebiniak, L. G. (1980). Strategy, distinctive competence, and organizational performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 25(2), 317–336.
- Thompson, A. A., Strickland, A. J., & Gamble, J. E. (2014). *Crafting and executing strategy: The quest for competitive advantage* (19th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
- Warui, M. W., Iravo, M. A., & Mwangi, J. K. (2015). Organizational structure and adoption of strategic planning in rural mission hospitals in Kenya. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, 3(6), 471–486.
- Wernerfelt, B. (1984). A resource-based view of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 5(2), 171–180.
- Wheelen, T. L., & Hunger, J. D. (2007). *Strategic management and business policy* (11th ed.). Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Werner, A. (2011). *Strategic management: A Southern African perspective*. Juta and Company Ltd.